PAPERS IN ILLINOIS HISTORY 1942

KING'S COLLEGE LIBRARY LONDON

SHL
WITHDRAWN

PERIODICALS
IVERSITY DEPOSITORY

UNIVERSITY DEPOSITORY (C.P.)

PAPERS IN ILLINOIS HISTORY

PAPERS

IN ILLINOIS HISTORY

AND TRANSACTIONS FOR THE YEAR 1942

KING'S COLLEGE LIBRARY LONDON

THE ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS

1944

PRINTED BY AUTHORITY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS
STATE OF ILLINOIS
DWIGHT H. GREEN, *Governor*

7
(54601)

G 3835
F 537 . I L6
Super. History

CONTENTS

Foreword vii

Southern Attitudes Toward Abraham Lincoln 1
Avery Craven

Colleges and College Life in Illinois One Hundred Years Ago 19
Ernest G. Hildner

The Democratic Element in the New Republican Party in Illinois, 1856-1860 32
Mildred C. Stoler

A New England Family on the Illinois Frontier 72
Alice Felt Tyler

Official Proceedings, 1942:
- Report of the Secretary 95
- Annual Business Meeting 101
- Meeting of the Board of Directors 103
- Officers and Directors 105

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/occasional-publications-of-ishs_1942

FOREWORD

Papers in Illinois History, 1942, is the sixth volume published under this title by the Illinois State Historical Society. Prior to 1937 the corresponding publication was entitled *Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society.*

Formerly, *Papers in Illinois History* was devoted in the main to papers read at the Society's annual meeting. In recent years, however, the character of the Society's meetings has changed, and fewer and fewer formal papers have been presented. This publication, consequently, has become the medium in which general studies in Illinois history are given publication. This year the division is equal: the papers of Professor Craven and Dean Hildner were read at the Jacksonville meeting; the other two papers were contributed in course.

Occasional misunderstandings make advisable the following statement of editorial policy: The staff of the Illinois State Historical Society takes every precaution to insure accuracy and objectivity, but contributors, rather than the Society, must be held responsible for matters of fact and points of view.

PAUL M. ANGLE, *Editor.*

SOUTHERN ATTITUDES TOWARD ABRAHAM LINCOLN

By AVERY CRAVEN*

I

The Civil War left deep scars on the South. Perhaps, as Ben Robertson says, men forget their victories and remember only their defeats. They cannot accept the fact that so many of their youth have died in vain. They must turn lost causes into glorious traditions.

Thus two generations and more of Southerners have looked back on the Civil War without apology. They have found a section's heroes in the men who wore the gray at Bull Run, at Gettysburg, and at Appomattox. They have even been willing, on occasion, to argue the soundness of states' rights and the justice of opposition to the violation of constitutional guarantees.

Most of them have been, from the first, thoroughly "reconstructed," certain that slavery had no place in a sound or democratic way of life, and just as certain that no tragedy could have been greater than the dismemberment of "our glorious Union." They have not, however, always accepted the Northern interpretations of American history and its evaluation of the men who represented the Northern point of view in periods of sectional conflict. They have had their own notions about Garrison and Seward and Lincoln. Early opinions were sometimes bitter and harsh, but time has wrought its changes and perspective has corrected many distortions. Today, however, the average Southerner, if one can be imagined, would probably approach Abraham Lincoln, who has come to symbolize the whole conflict, much as the average Northerner approaches Robert E. Lee—with reverence and an open mind, with generosity undistorted by hero worship. Being a Southerner no longer denies one a share in the nation's heritage of greatness.

But there is, in reality, no "average Southerner" and there never has been one. The region is populated by individuals. That great

* Professor of American History, University of Chicago.

varied world of tidewater plains and swamps, tumbling mountains, rich rolling uplands, and shifting Texas sands never achieved unity nor found an issue on which men from raw Arkansas, refined Charleston, the crude Tennessee mountains, and the easygoing bayous of Louisiana could long agree. Men and sections have tenaciously insisted on the right to individual opinions, and the variety produced has usually defied generalizations. An attempt to explain what the South thinks of Abraham Lincoln may end only in explaining what one Southerner thinks.

II

When Abraham Lincoln was nominated for the presidency in 1860, few Southerners knew anything about him. He was to them, even in 1861, largely a symbol and not a person. Their fear was not of the man but of the forces that had made him. The Republican Party, as they understood it, had determined to trample the Constitution underfoot and to deny to one part of the American people the security of their property and of their social system. Lincoln was the tool of that party. His personality and purposes could be taken for granted from that fact. Benjamin H. Hill put it this way:

> We do not fear Mr. Lincoln but we do fear the fanaticism he represents, the sectionalism that will triumph in his election, and the *passions* which his success will engender.[1]

Even after the election the *Richmond Enquirer* was still saying:

> Mr. Lincoln is little more than a cipher in the present count. . . . The significant fact which menaces the South is not that Abe Lincoln is elected President but that the Northern people, by a sectional vote, have elected a president for the avowed purpose of aggressions on Southern rights. . . . This is a declaration of war. . . . This is an act of war.[2]

An Alabama paper voiced the same sentiment:

> He, Lincoln, is not the thing to be feared; it is the power that pushed him up and will pull him down if he resists it.[3]

A few Southerners did, however, pay some attention to the man. One prominent leader wrote:

---

[1] *Southern Recorder* [Milledgeville, Ga.], Nov. 6, 1860.
[2] *Richmond Enquirer*, Nov. 19, 1860.
[3] *Montgomery Daily Mail*, Nov. 26, 1860.

> The mail brought confirmation of the report that the abolition convention at Chicago had not nominated Seward as expected, or Bates, or Chase, or Cameron, or Wade, who had been spoken of as the most probable alternate choices, but Lincoln of Illinois, inferior in ability and reputation to all.[4]

The *New Orleans Bee,* in like vein, insisted that Black Republicans had "evinced base ingratitude, but crafty and prudent policy" in pushing aside their real leader, William H. Seward, to make room for Lincoln. They had treated their founder most vilely "but had added materially to their own prospects of success" by choosing a leader from the moderate wing of their party.[5] The *Charleston Mercury* went even further. It saw the Republicans turning against Seward because he was disposed to temporize with the South, but lacked the necessary nerve to carry out measures for Southern subjugation. It called Lincoln a "proper tool" to do the job:

> The beau ideal of a restless, dogged, freesoil-border-ruffian, a vulgar mobocrat and Southern hater who would neither turn back from his work nor do it by halves.[6]

DeBow's Review cried:

> Just Heaven, upon what times have we fallen, when the seat of Washington is in danger of being occupied by this low and vulgar partisan of John Brown! Should that day arrive, is there not virtue enough in our people to break the ignoble shackles and proclaim themselves free? We believe it, and in that faith only find consolation.[7]

These personal thrusts at Lincoln, however, were hardly sincere. The basic resentment of the South was not against the man but rather

---

[4] Diary of Edmund Ruffin (MS, Library of Congress), May 21, 1860.

[5] May 21, 1860.

[6] Oct. 15, 1860. On the other hand the *New Orleans Daily Crescent* recalled the fact that in his campaign against Douglas for the Senate, in 1858, Lincoln had "conducted his canvass with distinguished ability, and no other man in the State was as capable as himself of encountering the intellectual 'Giant' of the Northwest." May 21, 1860.

[7] *DeBow's Review,* XXIX: 101. The *Richmond Enquirer,* on May 21, 1860, said: "His nomination argues a more determined hostility to the institutions of slavery than would the nomination of Seward. The latter has talents and ambition which might have operated to restrain his prejudices; but the former, an illiterate partisan, is without talents, without education, possessed only of his inveterate hatred of slavery and his openly avowed predilections for negro equality to recommend him to his party. . . . The selection between the traitors was decided by the intensity of the treason, and Lincoln, surpassing Seward in the bitterness of his prejudice and the insanity of his fanaticism, won the prize."

against the party which had made him its leader. True, some Southern spokesmen tried to identify Lincoln completely with their conception of the Republican Party—a conception which caused them always to designate it as "The Black Republican Party." He was "the facile tool and instrument of Greeley who made him what he is and who will control his administration, the High Priest of Republicanism" whose sentiments were mere echoes of "the crack of rifles of John Brown at Harper's Ferry."[8] A New Orleans newspaper labeled him "a thorough radical Abolitionist, without exception or qualification."[9] But in the main, Southern spokesmen ignored the candidate and attacked the party. It represented a "politico-fanatical movement" which had already invaded Southern rights and safety. "Its aggressions," said the *Richmond Enquirer,* "had not been intermittent nor fitful." It continued:

> They were the result of the constant growth of fanatical sentiment on the one hand, and, on the other, a disposition on the part of calculating politicians to foster and use for their own advancement this growing sentiment of intolerance against our domestic institutions.[10]

Republicans aimed at "Negro equality," and to consent to their domination was, as the *Keowee Courier* put it, "to consent to death."[11] The *Charleston Mercury* added:

> If this were the beginning of our difficulties in the South, if our present position of embarrassment and danger were not the result of years of accumulated aggression and wrong, there might be some hope of a favorable change . . . and that the parties of the country, like a spent flood, might return to their wonted channels of peace and usefulness. But the distemper of the times has been gathering virulence through twenty years of progress and agitation. It has been fed by the strongest passions of our nature, and nurtured by the meanest. It has obliterated all the old party lines, which stood for a half century dividing the opinion of the country. The last to perish . . . was the Democratic party. That too has fallen. One by one all its cardinal principles have been surrendered in the North to an absorbing sectionalism. And now the South stands alone behind her broken pledges, useless surrenders, disappointed hopes and sacrifices; before her a united North banded together against her rights and interests, threatening dan-

[8] *Montgomery Daily Mail,* July 27, 1860.
[9] *New Orleans Daily Crescent,* Nov. 12, 1860.
[10] Nov. 19, 1860.
[11] Aug. 18, 1860.

> gers. . . . The Northern people have forced upon us the conviction, reluctantly and slowly attained, that no submission on our part can win their forbearance, and no rights escape their violation, and that our safety rests in ourselves.[12]

In such editorials published during the summer of 1860 there is scanty mention of Abraham Lincoln. Only now and then does his name appear. Southerners had risen well above personalities and had concentrated on principles. Breckinridge Democrats were waging a campaign to arouse sectional fears and resentments; Constitutional Union leaders were intent on one last effort to check the growing secession fever. Not until the election was over was any great amount of attention paid to the candidate of the party. Even then the effort was largely one of interpreting the man in terms of what the different writers wanted his election to mean. Democrats pointed out his moderate words and actions. Lincoln was, as has been said, still largely a symbol.

This fact gave added importance to Lincoln's conduct and attitudes in the period between election and inauguration. Here was his chance to become a real personality in Southern minds, and to throw the weight of his understanding of sectional problems into the wavering scales. Already a sharper cleavage had appeared between the Southern radical and the Southern conservative. Moderates everywhere, but especially in the Border States, were inclined to emphasize the legality of Lincoln's election and to agree with the Nashville *Republican-Banner* that "every true American citizen should . . . acquiesce in the verdict." They saw:

> No evil existing,—no evil threatened,—even in the excited imagination of these mad disunionists, for which the remedies secured to us by the Federal Union and its constitutional guarantees are not fully adequate and vastly to be preferred, under all circumstances, to any remedy of secession or revolution.[13]

They "deeply deplored" Lincoln's election, but, as the Milledgeville *Southern Recorder* said, it did not afford "sufficient cause" for violent action. Common sense demanded that the South should wait for some "overt act."[14] According to the *Memphis Daily Morning Bulletin:*

---

[12] June 7, 1860.

[13] Nov. 7, 17, 21, 1860.

[14] Nov. 16, 1860. When Jefferson Davis said that he would go with Mississippi but would consider her as accepting infamy and degradation if she yielded to the North, the *Natchez Daily Courier* said: "Col. Davis is a respectable member of the United States Senate, a good officer, a prudent and brave soldier, but when he allows his rampant self-esteem and vanity to run away with his judgment, and to utter such huge, swelling words of self-assumption and self-superiority, he must

> It will not do to say that we will maintain the constitution only so long as its workings may suit our personal and sectional preferences. Such a rule of loyalty to government must soon degenerate into a struggle between contending factions and end in anarchy and constantly recurring revolution.

The *Bulletin* demanded that Lincoln be given a "fair trial."[15]

Radicals, on the other hand, were everywhere declaring that "the Rubicon has been passed," that "the struggle is over." They saw a race question thrust upon their section and viewed the election itself as the much demanded "overt act." They enlarged on Lincoln's wish to put slavery on the road to ultimate extinction. They saw him remaking the Supreme Court, and his Congress amending the Constitution so as to destroy Southern property and interests. One step would follow the other until the South would be reduced to colonial status, and all of this done legally and according to the Constitution.[16] "Our grievance from the election of Lincoln," said the Augusta *Constitutionalist,* "is not one of tangible and immediate wrong to our interests. It is an evidence on which we ground our apprehensions of future wrong. . . . It is more an insult than an injury."[17] Others talked of "the villainous oppressions" which "Abolitiondom contemplates in the not

---

disgust all independent and manly thinkers of all parties and creeds. Thank God, Mississippi has not yet sunk so low that she has to rely alone on the right arm of Col. Davis to assert and maintain her rights when molested." Nov. 17, 1860.

[15] Nov. 8, 1860. The *New Orleans Bee* stated on Nov. 8, 1860: "Against the manner of his election we do not see what we can allege. It is true that he was a sectional candidate; and equally true that with the exception of Missouri, Maryland, and, to a slight extent, Kentucky and Virginia, he polls no Southern vote; but as neither the Constitution nor the laws compel a candidate to receive votes in every state there can be no just ground for resistance or revolutionary movements on that score. . . . What we should do may, in our opinion, be summed up in a single word: WAIT."

[16] "If we submit the South is undone. The concentration of absolute power in the hands of the North will develop the wildest democracy ever seen on this earth," Lawrence Keitt to William Porcher Miles, Oct. 3, 1860. "All these ideas of aggressions, of wrongs, of grievances, *in the past,* do not clearly justify and demand a dissolution of the Union . . . and this is proved by the *undeniable* fact that all these things could have been overlooked or winked at, as they have in times past, had any of the other candidates than Lincoln been successful in the late contest. It is the election of Lincoln and the fear of its ultimate effects, coupled with the just exasperation at such an outrage, that drive people now to insist on equality or independence, more independence, in fact, than equality." Augusta *Daily Chronicle and Sentinel,* Dec. 1, 1860.

[17] Quoted in *Daily Chronicle and Sentinel,* Dec. 11, 1860. "The South does not look upon the triumph of Lincoln, *per se,* with any special apprehension, but simply regards it as the crown and capstone of grievances, the last straw on the camel's back, the drop that causes the cup of bitterness to overflow," *New Orleans Bee,* Nov. 28, 1860.

remote future," and saw it all as a "struggle for maintaining the ascendancy of our race in the South—our homes—we see no chance for victory but in withdrawing from the Union. To remain in the Union is to lose all that white men hold dear in government."[18]

The perilous silence which Lincoln maintained while these events took place, and while he waited in Springfield for Buchanan's administration to end, only added to the uncertainty which Southerners had felt during the campaign. His sharp refusal to entertain compromise measures, and his belief that the secession movement would be crushed by Southerners themselves, only served to discourage the conservatives who stood out against secession or understood that it was but a temporary step to be retaken when suitable concessions had been made. When, at length, he began talking, on his way to Washington and in his inaugural, the reaction was immediate and sharp. Clearly he did not grasp the seriousness of the situation nor understand the Southern mind. Clearly he did not have a well-worked-out program for dealing with the problems. How could he talk about "the property, peace and security of no section" being endangered by his administration and at the same time insist that the laws of the Union would be faithfully executed in states that had already severed their connection with the Union? How could he both uphold national authority and respect the rights of states that had interpreted their rights to include the possession of federal property within their borders?

Two Southern editorials, one from the *Montgomery Daily Post*[19] and the other from the *Nashville Union and American*,[20] will show in a general way the impression which Lincoln's early speeches made. The first was published the day before his arrival in Washington and referred to the speeches he had made en route. It read:

> We had entertained the opinion that Mr. Lincoln was a man of respectable ability, and that he would speak of the difficulties in which the country is involved, in a reasonable manner, and with a dignity becoming the high position he has been called to occupy; but the more we see and hear of his outgivings on his way to Washington, the more we are forced to the conclusion that he is not even a man of ordinary capacity. He assumes to be insensible of the difficulties before him—treats the most startling political questions

[18] *Montgomery Daily Mail*, quoted in Nashville *Republican Banner*, Nov. 11, 1860.

[19] Feb. 22, 1861.

[20] March 6, 1861.

with childish simplicity, and manifests much of the disposition of the mad fanatic, who meets his fate, not in the spirit of respectful Christian resignation, but with the insane smile of derision upon his lips, as if unconscious of the destiny that awaits him. We may readily anticipate that such a man will be the pliant tool of ambitious demagogues, and that his administration will be used to subserve their wicked purposes.

The second editorial was published on March 6 and referred to Lincoln's inaugural address:

> Mr. Lincoln vainly imagines the Government of this Union has come into his hands unbroken. He talks boastingly of enforcing laws in States which have proclaimed and established a separate government. He talks about using the power entrusted to him "to hold, occupy and possess the property and places belonging to the Government, to collect duties and imposts." This is either child's play or the madman's plea. He will shed no blood unless it is forced on him. By this he probably means that he will not use force, if every demand he makes is tamely complied with and every right, claimed by the Confederate States, is surrendered. Otherwise he *must* use force, or he is playing with words. . . . And, to make the condition of the poor, credulous Border States still more humiliating, he says that their contested rights of property and of peace must perpetually be subjected to the fiery ordeal of a numerical majority, in which it is notorious that the most vile abolition sentiments prevail. Great God! has it come to this? And are there any Southern men who are so base as to lick the hand that thus smites them to the earth?

With the attempt to provision Sumter and the beginning of war, Southern men thought themselves tricked and betrayed. The sad but stinging words of Jonathan Worth from conservative North Carolina best express their feelings:[21]

> I believe Lincoln had no right to call out the militia, make War and blockade the ports. . . . If the restoration of the Union was his object, which I believe was his object,—then he is a fool. If his purpose was to drive off all the Slave states, in order to make war on them and annihilate Slavery, then he is a Devil and in the latter supposition I could fight with a hearty good will.

In war times, as opponents are wont to do, Southern men defiled the leaders of the North and made untrue and unfair assertions regard-

[21] Letter to T. C. and B. G. Worth, May 13, 1861, J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, col. and ed., *The Correspondence of Jonathan Worth (Publications of the North Carolina Historical Commission,* Raleigh, 1909), I: 142.

ing their character. They talked much of Lincoln's crudeness—they called it "vulgarity"—and charged him with unnecessary cruelty. A half-dozen different tales were told of his illegitimate birth, causing a later writer to refer to him as "the many-sired Lincoln." He was said to be a half brother of Jefferson Davis—son of a Virginia Harrison—the progeny of five or six different travelers. At all events, they viewed him as lacking both in quality and proper feelings—a man well fitted to lead a depraved and unjust people in making war on the unoffending South.

The death of Lincoln at the hands of an assassin brought every variety of reaction in the South. Some openly exulted; some were indifferent; many clearly understood that the South had lost a friend. Mrs. Chesnut, who more than once had spoken of him as a vulgar clown, wrote in her diary: "This foul murder will bring upon us worse miseries."[22] Jefferson Davis' remark was: "I am sorry. We have lost our noblest and best friend in the court of the enemy. . . . I fear it will be disastrous to our people, and I regret it deeply."[23] Some Southern cities held meetings to condemn the murder and to express regret. Most of them soon understood the full meaning of Clement Clay's remark: "God help us! If that be true, it is the worst blow that yet has been struck at the South."[24]

III

This hasty survey of contemporary Southern opinion of Abraham Lincoln shows that it was about what we might have expected amid the passions of sectional strife and civil war. The more vital question is: What does the present South think of Lincoln? That question again calls for as many different answers as the number of individuals considered. The unreconstructed gentlemen, and particularly ladies, are still with us, and seldom still. Mildred Lewis Rutherford, in 1923,[25] declared that the South could never have her rightful place in history until the whole truth was known about Lincoln. And the truth, as she understood it, would completely dethrone him—reveal him as a

---

[22] Mary Boykin Chesnut, *A Diary from Dixie* (New York, 1929), 380.

[23] Robert McElroy, *Jefferson Davis* (New York, 1937), II: 486. McElroy's source is Stephen R. Mallory.

[24] *A Belle of the Fifties: Memoirs of Mrs. Clay, of Alabama . . . Put into Narrative Form by Ada Sterling* (New York, 1905), 245.

[25] Mildred Lewis Rutherford, *The South Must Have Her Rightful Place in History* (Athens, Georgia, 1923).

narrow partisan, enemy of both the South and of the Negro; a stranger to truth, whose words and acts seldom agreed; a destroyer of the Constitution; a man both inhumane and unmoral. Her general conclusion was that no person who truly loved the South could ever hold Abraham Lincoln in high regard.

The late Lyon G. Tyler, once president of William and Mary, was only a trifle less severe.[26] To him, Lincoln was not the "Savior of our Country" but the destroyer of our Federal Union; instead of Emancipator he should be known as the enemy of both the black and the white; his emancipation proclamation had as its purpose the precipitation of a race war—a veritable caldron of seething passion, "of murder, arson and rape." By no stretch of the imagination could he consider Lincoln a friend of the South, past or present!

But the unreconstructed are few and growing fewer. The great mass of present-day Southerners have quite a different feeling toward the man and his place in history. Most of the older ones had some doubts in early childhood regarding his greatness passed on to them by a generation bitter from Civil War memories. But these quickly disappeared and Lincoln took his place as one of the great men of the nation, more sinned against than sinning, with the worst that could be said about him being that *he was a Republican.* The younger generation, on the other hand, accepted him from the first as a national hero, less than Washington because they attended school on his birthday, but, nevertheless, a great figure. His picture hangs in some Southern schoolrooms and in a few public places. His greatness is now the Southern boy's heritage. He belongs to the common folk of a nation. Wherever democracy battles against oppression his name and fame are allies.

These attitudes have come with changing times in the South, with better schools and more Northern teachers, but most of all because the South has merged again back into the life of the nation. They represent an acceptance of points of view which are current in the country as a whole. They are not the result of either new or unbiased thinking. The South has merely come back into the national currents and her children have come to accept, with some reservations imposed by ante-bellum tradition, the general American pattern of thought regarding Abraham Lincoln.

[26] "A Criticism by Lyon Gardiner Tyler of 'History of the American People' by David S. Muzzey, of Massachusetts" (Richmond, 1932).

But there is another group whose opinions are of more value. It is largely composed of the younger historians of the old South. To them has fallen, in recent years, the task not only of revaluing the life of their own section, distorted alike by friend and foe, but also of reinterpreting the whole story of the War between the States, long distorted by the abolition propaganda of earlier days. They have viewed Lincoln from new angles. They have offered what are probably the true Southern attitudes toward the man. It is their estimate that has greatest value.

To begin with, this group of Southerners regards Lincoln, not as some unusual creation of the gods, but as a true representative of the great Northwest in its adolescent decades. They would point out the fact that the older portions of this region, along both sides of the Ohio River where lean, upland Southerners had first settled, had early outgrown their home market self-sufficing days, and had found in Henry Clay a spokesman for internal improvements as a way to outside markets. Clay had pressed for tariffs to build those markets, and for the distribution of proceeds from sale of public lands to aid both the older states and the newer, to which their ruined citizens were rapidly turning. Southern Illinois, as a part of this region, was therefore Whig in flavor, national in outlook, in the days when Abraham Lincoln grew to manhood. He took his political attitudes from these facts. Twenty years later, when he emerged into state prominence, the northern portion of this same Northwest along the Great Lakes had reached the same stage of development. The wheat surplus, which New England and Middle State settlers had early sold to a rapidly growing population at home, could find no outlet. The need was for new and wider markets, which could be found only through the building of railroads which would link the West to the older regions whose factories might be encouraged by larger protective tariffs. Furthermore, the heavy turning of Midwestern citizens, ruined by these new adjustments, toward Oregon and the nearer West, demanded a more liberal land policy. It was the same old call, in louder tones, which Henry Clay had answered a generation earlier in the Ohio Valley. But the Whig Party was a dying thing. A new party to carry the old Whig principles, and better to suit the dominant New England element along the Lakes, was demanded at the very moment when Lincoln and his kind were seeking a new political roof under which to gain office and to oppose the old Democratic enemies.[27]

[27] Avery Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War* (New York, 1942), 312-25.

The Republican Party had been born in the early 1850's to oppose the extension of slavery into the territories. A child of the Northwest, it had also included in its demands a railroad to the Pacific, and river and harbor improvements for the section. It early won a surprising number of Whigs to its standard but the conservatives held off. The practical politician waited.

> In October, 1854, . . . [Lincoln] left Springfield for the open prairies of central Illinois to escape a possible connection with the Republican Convention, called together by the antislavery idealists, and later repudiated the unauthorized use of his name on the Republican State Committee.[28]

There was too much of the crusading spirit about the party. Many of its members were prohibitionists; some were abolitionists. It was well to go slow.

The next few years, however, were to write large on the walls, and the practical politician soon found his way into the Republican ranks both to change the party and to be changed by it. Before 1860 it was the party of the railroad builders, who could not share in Douglas' schemes, of the high protective tariff advocates, and of the homestead interests. The old line Whigs had come to dominate the new Republican Party.

But they also made concessions. With considerable hesitation and liberal variations, they seemingly assumed a more aggressive attitude toward slavery. Yet it is impossible for Southern historians quite to make out what position such men as Lincoln did take on the question of slavery. In spite of all the logic expended on the problem, it still appears to most of them that he both accepted and rejected the institution where it existed; thought it should be done away with, yet condemned those who were trying to do away with it; said that "if all earthly power were given [him, he] should not know what to do as to the existing institution," and that he held inviolate state control of domestic institutions. On the other hand, he said that "this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." He made slavery an evil which had to be eradicated at the very time he blandly assured the South that it had nothing to fear. He drew the Western abolitionists to his support by the assurance that he would set slavery on the road to ultimate extinction; and held the conservatives by his declaration

[28] Arthur Charles Cole, *Lincoln's "House Divided" Speech* (Chicago, 1923), 7.

that "abolition doctrines tend rather to increase than abate its evils."

The very confusion in such statements caused one paper, in 1860, to say, "Mr. Lincoln's doctrines are the most subtle and dangerous form of anti-slaveryism."[29] A Southern historian in 1939 wrote:

> The old ideas about Lincoln not being an abolitionist and his elevation to power not being a menace to the institution of slavery are wholly wrong. The South was absolutely correct in its estimate of what had happened in the presidential election of 1860. . . . [By that time] Lincoln was the living embodiment of antislavery doctrine and antislavery action.[30]

Another, publishing in 1942, insisted:

> Lincoln . . . was, until he entered the White House, simply a lawyer from Springfield, Illinois—a man of great undeveloped capacities and narrowly limited background. He was far more fit to become than to be President.[31]

This writer asserted that Lincoln completely misunderstood the significance of South Carolina's Ordinance of Secession, "grossly underestimated the extent of the crisis, and perhaps, totally misconceived its nature." He considered Lincoln's policy up to the effort to provision Fort Sumter to have been as weak as that of Buchanan. He summarized "the much vaunted 'firm' policy" of Lincoln as follows:

> He would assert the Federal authority vigorously—but he would not exercise it. He would enforce the laws—where an enforcement mechanism existed. He would deliver the mails—unless repelled. He would collect the duties—offshore. He would hold the forts—at least the ones which Buchanan had held, and which seemed capable of holding themselves.[32]

All of which leaves Lincoln in those early days pretty much the Northwestern politician who, as Douglas said, took his coloring from his surroundings, and who had not yet realized that he was the president of a great nation facing its most serious crisis.

Because they believe that such conduct was only "tragic blundering," most Southern writers hold that the War between the States was not "an irrepressible conflict." They are certain it might have been

---

[29] *Louisville Daily Courier*, May 26, 1860.

[30] Dwight L. Dumond, *Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States* (Ann Arbor, Mich., 1939), 100.

[31] David M. Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis* (New Haven, Conn., 1942), 315.

[32] *Ibid.*, 329.

avoided. They believe that compromise might have delayed strife, and they are of the opinion that it is the stateman's business to compromise issues until a people have grown to higher levels where problems solve themselves. Only bigots have all of right on their side. A scholar from South Carolina declared a few years ago that Lincoln saved the Union by "the most terrible, the most inefficient method" possible. The subtitle of George Fort Milton's recent biography of Stephen A. Douglas is: "And the Needless War." I, myself, have been guilty of a volume entitled *The Repressible Conflict.*

The explanation of this attitude begins with Lincoln's new insistence on slavery as a moral issue, passes to his refusal to support the Crittenden Compromise, and ends with his handling of the Fort Sumter affair. This group views slavery as a relic of the past lingering on in this corner of the world. It was a dying affair, and, if let alone, or handled as a national problem, not as a Southern offense, it would have rapidly fallen of its own weight. Its extension was over; its economic value was everywhere doubtful; its evils were as apparent to Southern men as to those outside *if* the fanatic and the politician had not made it a matter for sectional strife.

Furthermore these Southerners believe that Lincoln, under Blair-Missouri influence, deliberately chose the use of force rather than conciliation in handling the first seceding states. When he refused the Crittenden Compromise he was thinking of the salvation of his party, not of the Union. He knew that the Republican Party was a raw, unformed thing made up of widely divergent elements held together only by the hostility to slavery expansion and the desire for office. It had won its first victory by a minority vote. Compromise on the extension of slavery might save *the Union;* it would certainly wreck *the party.* Neither he nor his colleagues actually feared that slavery would enter the existing territories—there were only two slaves in Kansas in 1860—but to yield an abstract principle would, as Samuel J. Tilden said, cause the party to go "utterly to pieces before it could organize the government."[33]

The handling of affairs at Fort Sumter was in like vein. The late Professor Charles W. Ramsdell of the University of Texas once asserted his belief that:

> Lincoln's course as to Sumter was from the outset aimed at

[33] Samuel J. Tilden to Wyndham Robertson, Jan. 18, 1860 (MS).

getting the Confederates to fire the first gun.[34]

Others have quoted Lincoln's letter to Captain Fox in which he says:

> You and I both anticipated that the cause of the country would be advanced by making the attempt to provision Fort Sumter, even if it should fail; and it is no small consolation now to feel that our anticipation is justified by the result.[35]

They never miss the opportunity to point out the entry which Orville Browning made in his diary after a conference with Lincoln:

> He himself conceived the idea. . . . The plan succeeded. They attacked Sumter—it fell, and thus, did more service than it otherwise could.[36]

To the Southerner this is a confession of aggressive action at a time when delay and conciliation might have strengthened the hands of those who labored for peace. The Border States were in the control of conservatives. Virginia, for example, was overwhelmingly against secession. Only Lincoln's call for volunteers drove her into the Confederacy. Her economic life from 1840 to 1860 had become much more like that of Pennsylvania and New York than it was like that of Alabama or Mississippi. Wheat was her great cash crop, and both Hussey and McCormick had there brought the reaper to successful completion. General farming had taken the place of large-scale staple production. The theory and practice of scientific agriculture equaled that of any other part of the nation. Her flour was famed in the markets of South America. Packet boats nightly carried fresh vegetables and berries from her gardens to the markets in Philadelphia, Baltimore, and New York. Northern immigrants were moving in by the hundreds. Slavery was on the decline. Furthermore, manufacturing had taken a new hold, and her political attitudes were shifting and dividing. Ritchie, Wise, and Hunter formed alliances with the leaders of the Middle States and looked to them for support in the quest of national office. The friends of the Union were strong.[37] The *Staunton Spectator* declared South Carolina "a nuisance anyway," and Marmaduke Johnson of Richmond

---

[34] "Lincoln and Fort Sumter," *Journal of Southern History,* III, no. 3 (Aug., 1937), 259-88.

[35] S. W. Crawford, *The Genesis of the Civil War* (New York, 1887), 420.

[36] Theodore C. Pease and James G. Randall, eds., *The Diary of Orville Hickman Browning (Illinois Historical Collections,* XX, Springfield, 1925), I: 476.

[37] Avery Craven, "Soil Exhaustion . . . in Virginia and Maryland," *University of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences,* Vol. XIII, no. 1 (March, 1925), 122-61.

wanted to take her "by the neck and throw her into the bottomless pit, never to be resurrected."[38] Lincoln might have saved the state from secession by delay and compromise.

And if Virginia had remained loyal there is every reason to believe that North Carolina and Tennessee would have done likewise. If so, Robert E. Lee and the Army of Northern Virginia might never have begun their tragic careers. At least, says the Southern historian, this was a possibility which Lincoln never allowed a chance!

IV

If the Southern historians' attitude toward Lincoln up to this point seems unduly critical, it is certainly not so regarding the man in the years after 1861. From that point onward they viewed him as rising above party—even above self—and achieving greatness such as few Americans have achieved. The Northwestern politician was left far behind. Drifting ceased. His understanding of issues and men became acute and decisive. His mind caught fundamentals, and he spoke not only for a nation but for mankind.

Northern writers have too long thought of Lincoln in terms of emancipation and Union. Neither of these contributions is enough to create an Olympian figure. Lincoln had no great affection for the Negro or no all-prevailing desire to free him except as a military measure. His act was inspired as much by diplomacy as by humanitarian motives. And as for the Union, Lincoln is far more the creator of a new order than the savior of the one bequeathed by the Fathers. There are more significant facts in his service and stature than these. To Lincoln the Negro had to be emancipated in order to save the Union and the Union was worth the saving only because it was the embodiment of an *idea.* It must never be forgotten that the significance of America to mankind is as *an experiment in democracy.* The Civil War was, in Lincoln's own words, a struggle testing whether that kind of government, or any other so conceived, could long endure, or whether it must perish from the face of the earth. Nor should it be forgotten that in the defense of slavery the Southern logicians had been forced to defend a form of society which was a complete denial of democracy. Their assertions were as theoretical and abstract as Lincoln's; but they were positive in

[38] Henry T. Shanks, *The Secession Movement in Virginia, 1847-1861* (Richmond, 1934), 134-35.

their insistence on the superiority of a stratified society, resting on slave mudsills at the bottom and rearing a superior aristocracy at the top. "Inequality among men is the will of God," declared President William A. Smith of Randolph-Macon College in 1856. "I have no hesitation in pronouncing . . . [the dogma that all men are created free and equal] false and absurd," said Professor P. H. Mill of Mercer University. "It is both false and foolish," echoed the venerable Edmund Ruffin.[39]

John C. Calhoun had early proclaimed slavery the only solution to the labor problem. He stated:

> There is and always has been in an advanced stage of wealth and civilization, a conflict between labor and capital. The condition of society in the South exempts us from the disorders and dangers resulting from this conflict; and which explains why it is that the political situation of the slave-holding States has been so much more stable and quiet than that of the North.

The existing relations between the two races in the South formed

> The most solid and durable foundation on which to rear free and stable political institutions.[40]

It remained, however, for George Fitzhugh to carry this to its logical conclusion, and to insist that for a sound social order "slavery, *black or white,* was right and necessary." Free competition among laboring men only reduced them to helpless want and ultimate dependence on charity. How much better to make them the slaves of one man instead of the slaves of Society![41] The *Richmond Enquirer* was only echoing his position when it said:

> Slavery is the natural condition for the laboring man, whether *white or black*. . . . Master and slave is a relation in society as natural and necessary as parent and child; and the Northern States will yet have to introduce it.[42]

---

[39] The complete proslavery argument is best presented in William Sumner Jenkins, *Pro-slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1935). For a briefer summary see Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War,* 151-74; William A. Smith, *Lectures on the Philosophy and Practice of Slavery* (Nashville, 1856), 62-63; P. H. Mill, *Slavery Is Neither a Moral, Political, nor Social Evil* (Penfield, Ga., 1844); Ruffin Diary, July 20, 1857.

[40] J. C. Calhoun, *Works* (New York, 1856), II: 632.

[41] George Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South* (Richmond, 1854), 473; appendix, 225.

[42] Quoted by Arthur Charles Cole, *Lincoln's "House Divided" Speech,* 31.

More clearly than any other man of his day, Abraham Lincoln saw the full meaning of such words. The white man's freedom was as much involved as that of the Negro. In his famous Peoria address he issued the solemn warning:

> In our greedy chase to make profits of the Negro, let us beware lest we "cancel and tear to pieces" even the white man's charter of freedom.

Constantly he reiterated his faith in the Declaration of Independence and the soundness of government based upon its tenets. In his first annual message he said:

> It continues to develop, that the insurrection is largely, if not exclusively, a war upon the principles of popular government—the rights of the people.

In his speech at Philadelphia in February, 1861, he revealed his whole philosophy in the statement that the Declaration of Independence "gave liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to all the world for all future time."

Here was Lincoln in his true role as the great democrat, the spokesman not alone of the common man of America but of the common man the world over. He, like De Tocqueville, had seen America, "more than America . . . the image of democracy itself . . . [and what the world might] have to fear or to hope from its progress." In so doing, the plain humble citizen of the prairies had seen deeper and farther than any man of his day. He had understood that a Union dedicated to the hope of mankind was worth saving even at the cost of four long and bitter years of civil war. By this understanding the South, as well as the North, was to profit.

COLLEGES AND COLLEGE LIFE IN ILLINOIS ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO

By ERNEST G. HILDNER*

Curiously enough, higher education preceded the establishment of a system of lower schools in this state. The early stream of settlement into Illinois came mainly from the southeast and south by way of the Ohio, Mississippi, and Illinois rivers. These pioneers, bred in the tradition that education was a personal and not a public affair, evidenced little interest in the establishment of a common school system or even in the creation of institutions of higher education. Not until long after Illinois had attained statehood was a system of public schools formed, and then it was done under the guidance of Newton D. Bateman, a graduate of one of the state's pioneer colleges and later president of another.

It is perhaps instructive to look abroad for a moment. While in Illinois, schools and colleges were established on a hit or miss basis according to the wishes of local groups, sometimes in opposition to the opinion of most of the inhabitants of the state, but more often with the majority indifferent to things educational, such was not the case in the lake states which stemmed directly from New England. There an educational system was set up at once. In Michigan the territorial legislature had provided for an institution of higher learning. Upon attaining statehood, the legislature provided in its first session for a unified public school system with a state university as its capstone, and all private colleges were prohibited. Similar action was taken in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

The impulse leading to the founding of colleges in Illinois came from organized religion. Ministers and laymen were concerned over the future of their respective denominations, and to each group it seemed that part of the answer was to set up a center of learning. So it was that the Methodists established a seminary at Lebanon in 1828. In March, 1830, the name was changed from Lebanon Seminary to McKen-

* Dean, Illinois College, Jacksonville, Ill.

dree College, though it would appear that instruction of a collegiate grade was not offered until 1835, and no degrees granted before 1841.[1] Even before the seminary was established at Lebanon, the Baptists had started at school at Rock Spring in 1827. It seems to have been discontinued, and a successor was founded at Upper Alton in 1832. It was called a college. Instruction on that level began in 1833, and the first students were graduated in 1837.[2] Meanwhile the Reverend John Millot Ellis had proposed that the Presbyterians establish a college, and had succeeded in interesting a group of Congregational theological students at Yale in the project. This alliance resulted in the foundation of Illinois College in 1829 and the beginning of instruction in January, 1830. Since none of the applicants were sufficiently prepared, instruction on a collegiate level could not begin until 1831, and the first class was graduated in 1835.[3] Later in the decade, Knox College was established as an integral part of the "Plan" of the Reverend George Washington Gale. The college received its charter in 1837, but instruction did not begin until 1841.[4]

The three older colleges had a difficult time in securing charters from the state legislature. The state as a whole seemed suspicious of the movement establishing colleges, and this was shared in full measure by members of the legislature, one of whom proudly proclaimed he was "born in a briar thicket, rocked in a hog trough and had never had his genius cramped by the pestilential air of a college."[5] As a result, it was only after considerable effort and difficulty that the first college charters were secured on February 19, 1835. By this act, McKendree, Shurtleff, and Illinois colleges were granted legal recognition simultaneously, along with a college to be founded at Jonesboro. Three stringent restrictions in the charters show the fears of the legislature. The establishment of theological departments was prohibited, no college was to be permitted to hold more than 640 acres of land, and the profession

[1] W. C. Walton, *Centennial History of McKendree College* (Lebanon, Ill., 1928), 119-26.

[2] Austin Kennedy de Blois, *The Pioneer School; A History of Shurtleff College, the Oldest Educational Institution in the West* (New York, 1900), 29-97 *passim*.

[3] Charles Henry Rammelkamp, *Illinois College; A Centennial History, 1829-1929* ([New Haven, Conn.], 1928), 40, 68-69.

[4] Earnest Elmo Calkins, *They Broke the Prairie: Being some account of the settlement of the Upper Mississippi Valley by religious and educational pioneers, told in terms of one city, Galesburg, and of one college, Knox* (New York, 1937), 32.

[5] Rammelkamp, *Illinois College*, 65.

of any particular religious faith could not be required for admission. The first two named provisions were repealed on February 26, 1841.[6]

Other institutions were projected or begun in this period. Jonesboro College, already referred to, seems never to have had an existence beyond its charter. McDonough College, located at Macomb, was incorporated by interested citizens in 1836. Instruction began on a preparatory level in 1837, but a full college course was not given until 1851. It had been hoped that the Presbyterians would take the sponsorship of the college, but when this did not materialize, the local Masonic lodge purchased it in conformity with a plan to establish an Illinois Masonic College. The Grand Lodge of Illinois declined the offer, and it then became a high school under direction of the Schuyler Presbytery. A new charter was secured, and collegiate instruction began in 1851, but the college was closed in 1855 due to a lack of expected support from the Presbyterian church.[7] At the same time an attempt was made to found a college at Canton in 1836 and the institution was incorporated in the following year, but it ceased to exist in 1843. It is doubtful if instruction on a level higher than preparatory was ever given.[8] A university was projected at Rock Island and incorporated in 1840. Some effort must have been made to start instruction as a Chancellor was appointed.[9] It has been impossible to learn more of its existence except that in 1845 a petition was presented to the General Assembly asking a change in the charter, which was not acted upon. Most interesting of the nonsurviving institutions was Jubilee College, located near Peoria. Here Bishop Philander Chase had been maturing his plans for the college through the late Thirties. The first class was graduated in 1847, and the charter was secured in January of the same year.[10] Several female seminaries were established during this period, but since no collegiate instruction was offered until after 1850, they will not be discussed. In general it would seem that the colleges which survived and

[6] Rammelkamp, *Illinois College,* 543-46, quotes the act of incorporation and the amendment.

[7] Newton Bateman and Paul Selby, eds., *Historical Encyclopedia of Illinois and History of McDonough County* (Chicago, 1907), II: 694-95.

[8] Mildred Eversole, "Canton College, an Early Attempt at Higher Education in Illinois," *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society,* Vol. XXXIV, no. 3 (Sept., 1941), 334-43.

[9] Jonathan A. Woodruff, *An Inaugural Address Delivered before the Board of Trustees of the Rock-Island University, at the First Annual Commencement of that Institution, August 25, 1841* (Rock Island, Ill., 1841).

[10] *The Motto* [*Jubilee College*], Vol. I, no. 8 (July 11, 1849), 177. See also Roma Louise Shively, *Jubilee, A Pioneer College* (Elmwood, Ill., 1935).

grew were not only related to some religious organization, but also had associated with them one or more strong personalities to carry them over the trying formative years.

Perhaps the most important of the questions which were faced by the founders of these colleges was that of finance, a problem continuous to the present day. In the case of each of the surviving institutions, the first step was to circulate a local subscription list. As a rule very little cash was pledged; land, labor, and materials formed the bulk of the donations. Funds for the actual operation were expected from the East until the West could become self-supporting. As a result, each of the colleges elected a president who journeyed to Illinois to look over the scene of his future labors, then returned to the seaboard to ask for funds from friends and coreligionists. This is illustrated by a letter from John Mason Peck, financial agent of Shurtleff, written to Dr. Haskell, treasurer of the college in Alton, in the fall of 1835, announcing that he had succeeded in raising more money in Boston than Edward Beecher, president of Illinois College, who was in the city at the same time on the same mission.[11] Help, mostly in the form of pledges, was thus secured, and each of the colleges began a program of expansion later to be cut short by the panic of 1837 and the repudiation of promises of financial aid. The West was harder hit than the East so only one course appeared open: renewed appeals to the East. Since the frontier was not peculiar to Illinois, and struggling institutions in other areas had the same plans and hopes, there was a considerable overlapping of these appeals directed toward those best able to contribute. This multiplication of requests for financial assistance became so great that in 1843 the Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West was organized to co-ordinate the drives of those having a Presbyterian or Congregational background. This was of assistance to members, but all colleges of the state enjoyed the gradual return to a more prosperous life during the Forties. With the loosening of the financial stringency, again plans for expansion were made, only to be cut short by the panic of the late Fifties.

The curriculums in these colleges were patterned after those found in the eastern colleges. With some variation, all these institutions taught the same subjects. The chief difference between them was in the years in which particular subjects were given. In general all can-

[11] De Blois, *Pioneer School*, 69-70.

didates for admission were expected to have some knowledge of Latin, Greek, arithmetic, English grammar, and geography. Once admitted, the student found that the core of the curriculum for the first two years was composed of Latin, Greek, and mathematics. In the third year it became a bit more liberal. While the classical languages were continued, philosophy, natural philosophy—today called physics—and perhaps a modern language, were introduced. In the senior year Paley's *Evidences of Christianity,* and United States government or political economy were studied. At Illinois College a series of lectures in chemistry was given on a voluntary basis in the junior and senior years. Geology was offered in the same fashion. Other colleges followed much the same practices. In one thing they were all alike: English composition and forensic practice were required of all students during all four years.[12]

The men who comprised the faculties of these early colleges, especially those colleges which survived this era, were filled with the faith that moved mountains. They existed on small salaries which were usually in arrears. At Illinois College in 1837, President Edward Beecher received $1,100 and quarters, Julian M. Sturtevant, first instructor, $750 and quarters, while two others were paid $900, but had to supply their own houses. One professor received $1,000 without housing, but in 1840 all but one were raised to $1,100.[13] At McKendree College the president's salary in 1834 was $600, although in that year it was raised to $700.[14] With all the difficulties which they faced, they had need of the strong religious convictions which sustained them through the painful and poverty-stricken years. In each of the early institutions the majority of the faculty was composed of ordained ministers, or men who were using teaching as a stopping point on the way toward ordination. As might have been expected, most of these came from New England.[15] The faculties were small, and their personalities had a deep influence on the students entrusted to their care. William H. Herndon, for example, infected by the virus of antislavery at Illinois College, was withdrawn by his father for this reason.[16]

Many of these men were independent thinkers, and as a result their views were questioned by their fellow denominationalists. Heresy trials

---

[12] See the early catalogues of the colleges for the courses of study.
[13] Rammelkamp, *Illinois College,* 52.
[14] Walton, *McKendree College,* 120.
[15] J. M. Sturtevant, Jr., ed., *Julian M. Sturtevant, an Autobiography* (New York, 1896), 191-92.
[16] Quotation from Herndon in Rammelkamp, *Illinois College,* 103.

and charges of heterodox opinions not only disturbed the local campus and community but also were reflected throughout the state.[17] This was especially marked at Illinois and Knox colleges which were founded by both Presbyterian and Congregational groups under the Plan of Union.[18] To the local college this was a real burden, when added to the problems of finance faced by each of them.

In the founding of each of the early colleges, one of the first steps was the construction of a small masonry building. This was designed to contain not only the classrooms but living quarters as well. In relation to the resources of the institution, the cost of these was high, but most difficult to overcome was the lack of skilled craftsmen to perform the necessary labor.[19] Most of the skilled labor on the frontier preferred to devote its energy to the land which could be so cheaply purchased. At Knox the first structure was a wooden building used for classes as well as for a church. This building and the Ladies' Seminary, likewise used by the college, both burned. The first building erected on the campus proper, known as "East Bricks," was constructed in 1844.[20] The buildings which remain on the various campuses to the present day are among the most cherished memorials of the founders.

Within a short time the original quarters were found to be inadequate, and each of the institutions erected large frame structures to serve as dormitories and to provide additional classroom space. These were distinguished by size and utility rather than by any pretensions to architectural beauty. Fortunately fire has removed these eyesores. In that early agricultural era, each campus was also equipped with a barn, or barns, and other outbuildings, and was also the possessor of a college shop in which were carried on various handicrafts.

The students at these early colleges came from all walks of life. Generally they were poor, and the charges were a heavy burden on their finances. One who looks over the catalogues of the colleges of this period is amazed at the sources from which students were drawn. While most of the student body came from Illinois, others were attracted here from far afield. The Illinois College catalogue of 1841-1842 shows

---

[17] [E. Adkins], comp., *A Narrative of Facts and Proceedings Connected with the Recent Changes in the Faculty of Shurtleff College* (St. Louis, 1855).

[18] Calkins, *They Broke the Prairie,* 172-73, 185-95; Sturtevant, *Autobiography,* 198-200.

[19] Walton, *McKendree College,* 112.

[20] Martha Farnham Webster, *Seventy-five Significant Years: the Story of Knox College, 1837-1912* (Galesburg, Ill., 1912), 61.

a total of fifty undergraduates; of these forty were from Illinois, five from Missouri, two from Pennsylvania, and one each from Ohio, Delaware, and New York. Limitation was placed on the age of the candidate for admission. The usual requirement was that he be over fourteen years before he was acceptable. Since the school system of Illinois was not in existence, education in most communities was a casual affair dependent upon the energy of parents in securing a suitable and available teacher. Most of the applicants were wretchedly prepared, and to maintain standards and meet a real need, all the colleges were compelled to maintain preparatory departments. In many cases these had larger enrollments than the colleges themselves, but they were never allowed to become more important in the eyes of the trustees or the Administration. It is worth noting here that while coeducation often took place on an academy or seminary level and was talked of for the colleges, throughout this period collegiate instruction was almost purely masculine.

As might have been expected of colleges closely associated with churches, the students were usually eager to enter one of the learned professions, especially the ministry. Other professions claimed them as well, but not in the same numbers. In the first ten graduating classes at Illinois College there were sixty-two degrees awarded. Thirty-two of these graduates became clergymen, seven physicians, six lawyers, two educators, two bankers, two farmers, and one an inventor. The occupation of the remainder is unknown.[21] Of the first twenty-five graduates of Knox, eleven entered the ministry.[22] Undoubtedly the same general pattern could be shown by the other colleges.

Students were usually housed in the large frame structures to which reference has been made. The usual practice was to assign two boys to a room, the furnishings of which were to be provided by the occupants according to their tastes and funds. One of the early Illinois College catalogues stated:

> The expenses of outfit are chiefly for furnishing a room. These are not annual expenses, nor are they borne by one alone, each occupant of a room being expected to defray his part of the expense. The most essential are a plain table, two or three chairs, a pail, a washbowl and a pitcher, andirons, shovel and tongs, bedstead

[21] Information furnished by the Illinois College Alumni Office.

[22] Donald G. Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War* (New York, 1932).

> and bedding. With the exception of a bed, these articles can be easily purchased here at reasonable rates. A bed and bedclothes, if purchased here, will cost from ten to thirty dollars; but in all cases when it can be done, it is advisable for a student to bring a bed and bedclothes with him. The expense of the other articles must vary with the student's habit of economy. For articles of a plain and suitable kind, it will cost from nine to twelve dollars for a room; or from five to six dollars for each student. The furniture, if carefully used, can be sold, when no longer needed, with a reasonable deduction. The same is true of books.[23]

Tuition and other expenses of the year 1844 at Illinois College were estimated as follows: tuition, $20; room, $10; board, $50; wood, light, books, and stationery, $15—a total of $95. Knox charged $24 for tuition,[24] Shurtleff estimated the total expense in 1851 at $120.[25] Many modern parents may look longingly at these figures as contrasted with those of the present day, but to a college student on the frontier where money was scarce it represented a sum which could be secured only with difficulty, if at all.

Two factors, the manual labor college idea, and the lack of ready money in the West, combined to make the proposal of providing a college farm and workshop for students an attractive one to the founders of these early colleges. It was believed that this practice could bring about reduced student expenses as well as increased income for the college. Illinois College, in 1834, encouraged prospective students with limited funds by assuring them: "Opportunity will be given . . . to employ a portion of each day in manual labor, either on the farm, or in the work shop, by means of which, a part of the expenses of a course of education may be defrayed."[26] In the long run, however, each college found that this was unprofitable, due to the carelessness or indifference of the students. Within a short time the plan was generally abandoned.[27] Extra land, of which each college had too much in those days, might be rented to students. This enabled them to earn money by the production and sale of crops or to use the produce in boarding themselves, along with

---

[23] *Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Illinois College, for the Year Ending June 1844* (Alton, Ill., 1844), 13.

[24] Calkins, *They Broke the Prairie,* 130.

[25] De Blois, *Pioneer School,* 121.

[26] *Catalogue of the Officers and Students in Illinois College, 1834-35* (Jacksonville, Ill., 1834), 15.

[27] Mary Turner Carriel, *The Life of Jonathan Baldwin Turner* ([Jacksonville, Ill.], 1911), 43-44.

some extras supplied from home. By this method boarding expenses could be materially reduced, although the health of students suffered by unwise economy. At Knox College, young Newton Bateman "supported himself unaided through his college course; his boarding expenses during the sophomore year averaged only eleven cents per week and through the whole four years averaged only forty-five cents per week."[28]

In contrast to this, Bishop Philander Chase had a different plan for Jubilee College. His aim was a college surrounded by farm lands, owned by itself. Here the students would be removed from the temptations offered by urban communities. In order that the proper control over the environment might be provided, Bishop Chase proposed that the farms should be operated by tenants at will. This would permit immediate expulsion of any tenant considered a bad influence on the students. As a result, most of the funds of the college were invested in land, which, when the titles were found to be defective and were awarded to others by court action, proved to be the death blow to the college.[29]

As most of the student bodies were housed in frame dormitories the danger of fire was an ever present one, and each governing body issued stringent regulations designed to reduce the hazard to a minimum. Each room was heated by its own fireplace or stove. Rules forbade the carrying of live coals in the building except in closed vessels, a rule which seems to have been not too well obeyed. This same fear of fire resulted in stern measures against students' indulging in a prank, common at the time, of packing a door lock with sulphur or gunpowder and setting it off.[30] For this, expulsion was not uncommon, and flogging not unknown. Discipline of all sorts was supervised by the faculty, either in rotation, or by appointment of one member to be responsible.[31] Regulations for the students' conduct were more like preparatory school rules than those associated with college today. As a result there were constant infractions, and the most common sentence was a public apology given in the chapel. Drinking was common, and for habitual intoxication the result was expulsion. Other things which today might be considered harmless, such as attendance at the circus, were a matter

[28] William Edward Simonds, "Newton Bateman, State Superintendent of Public Instruction and President of Knox College," *Illinois State Historical Society Transactions for the Year 1935* (Springfield, [1936]), 142-43.
[29] *The Motto,* Vol. II, no. 6 (March 30, 1852), 157-61.
[30] Rammelkamp, *Illinois College,* 79.
[31] Carriel, *Jonathan B. Turner,* 46-47.

of prayerful consideration by the president and trustees.[32] Of course there was trouble over the woodpile and pump, and this sometimes grew into fights in which the tactics of the frontier rather than those of the prize ring were the rule.

Most important in the social as well as the intellectual life of the students were the literary societies. Modeled after similar societies in the eastern colleges, they followed much the same patterns of activity. Such organizations were encouraged by the faculties, and by the Forties had become quite strong. While there are variations from college to college and society to society, it is a safe generalization that each, to a degree, restricted its membership and provided means whereby candidates could be selected for admission. In some cases a slight element of secrecy was maintained while in others there was no such pretense.

The core of the literary society was the weekly program, usually consisting of essays, orations, and debates. Subjects covered in these meetings ran the gamut of human experience and intellect. Questions of the day were quite frequently discussed, and debate waxed hot over such issues as the abolition of slavery. Time, place, and length of meeting were considered and strictly regulated by faculty action. The culmination of the year was the annual exhibition or open meeting at which members gave what they hoped was an outstanding program for the benefit of the public. These were elaborate affairs, and were taken very seriously by the societies.

On the educational side, their most important function was in providing library facilities for the membership. Small dues were charged, and the money collected was spent for periodicals and books. Libraries grew slowly, both by purchase and gift, but they were the chief source of books available to the students. In that period college libraries were small and almost inaccessible. Often they were open only once a week for a short period, and excessive charges were made for their use. We are told that at Illinois College:

> Students who wished to have access to the library were required to pay a fee of fifty cents per term. For some unaccountable reason, the number of books a student might draw for use at home, depended upon the size of the volumes. A student might borrow at one time two octavo or smaller volumes, but only one folio or quarto volume.[33]

[32] Calkins, *They Broke the Prairie,* 136; Rammelkamp, *Illinois College,* 80-81; Walton, *McKendree College,* 120-21.

[33] Rammelkamp, *Illinois College,* 55.

Thus the convenience of the society collection, as well as its utility, was a strong factor in sustaining its membership. No training could have been more valuable than membership in a society for students, particularly young clergymen and lawyers who were preparing for professions in which they would have to appear before the public.[34]

Athletics as we know them were not a part of college life until after the Civil War. There was no science of physical education and college gymnasiums did not exist. As a result there were no intercollegiate competitions and no organized games or sports. Students then as now had to work off surplus energy, and spontaneous games were the result. As might be expected in a thinly populated area, hunting and fishing engaged some of the free time of the students.[35] Such activities were more than sports, however, for the game and fish were welcome additions to the larder, especially for those who were trying to save money by boarding themselves. Swimming was indulged in whenever opportunity offered.[36] One can presume that this was as much for personal comfort as for sport, since regular bathing facilities were nonexistent or of the most primitive character.

The day of the student was a long one. While the hours might vary slightly from institution to institution and from season to season, a fairly accurate generalized picture may be drawn. He rose about five-thirty at the summons of the college bell, and at six was in chapel for a devotional exercise. This was followed by breakfast, then class sessions began at seven-thirty and lasted until five, with an hour out for lunch. When not in class he was expected to be at work on the college farm or in the shop, at least as long as the manual labor scheme was in operation. About six o'clock supper was served, and this was followed by evening chapel. The 1844 catalogue for Illinois College contained this solemn statement: "Public prayers are attended in the College Chapel every morning and evening, with the reading of the Scriptures and Sacred Music; all the students are required to be present."[37] Following evening chapel the student's time was his own

---

[34] For short accounts of societies see: Calkins, 131-32; Walton, 297-316; Rammelkamp, 127-35; De Blois, 107-108. See also for more extended works: William W. Greene, *Semi-Centennial History of Alpha Zeta Society of Shurtleff College* (Alton, Ill., 1898); John Self, "Centennial History of Sigma Pi" (MS in archives of Sigma Pi, Illinois College).

[35] Calkins, *They Broke the Prairie,* 180.

[36] De Blois, *Pioneer School,* 80-81.

[37] *Catalogue, Illinois College, 1844,* p. 14.

until bedtime, although various rules were passed with the intention of confining him to his room for study. Sunday was free of classes but students were compelled to attend divine services, if not at the college chapel, then at the church of their choice.[38] Evidence was required that they had actually been in attendance.

Commencement was the high point of the college year for both students and faculty. Originally this was held late in the summer, but by the early Forties all these colleges had changed to June. The exercises were all-day affairs. Each member of the graduating class delivered an oration and suitable musical numbers were rendered. Prizes and honors were conferred. As though there had not been enough speaking, members of the lower classes were often placed on the program for additional orations and essays. Not only was this a gala day for the graduates but also for the community. People came from miles around to spend the entire day, or, if from a distance, to spend the nights before and after, in the college town.[39]

One cannot leave the subject of the colleges and college life of early Illinois without some mention of the slavery question. This was a live question throughout the period. It is safe to say that, going from southern to northern Illinois, abolition sentiment increased. McKendree, at Lebanon, was less antislavery than the others. Two years after the death of Lovejoy, her board took formal action demanding that persons expressing abolition sentiments sever their connection with the college.[40] Shurtleff, at Alton, was also antiabolitionist in order to keep her connections with possible students from Missouri. Illinois College never took a stand as a college but the faculty, including President Beecher, who helped guard Lovejoy's press, were outstanding abolitionists, and were so known throughout the state. Knox was out-and-out abolitionist. With the characters of the founders and their previous connections, none of the colleges could have stood otherwise than they did. Founded, nurtured, and molded as they were by men of strong character and public spirit, the question remained one of the engrossing subjects of discussion, as well as action, until it was settled by war.

Each of the older colleges of the state has in some measure published a history of its founding and early struggles. In every case the

[38] *Catalogue, Illinois College, 1844,* p. 14.
[39] Webster, *Seventy-five Significant Years,* 64; Carriel, *Jonathan B. Turner,* 60.
[40] Walton, *McKendree College,* 40.

emphasis has been on the unique character of the institution. The casual reader might imagine that each college existed alone on the new Illinois frontier. An examination of the various histories, together with material on institutions which have no historian, will show, however, that all these early colleges had much in common, that the frontier shaped them to its mold, much as the colleges, themselves, shaped the following generation. The object of this paper has been to show the essential unity of the colleges and college life to the year 1850.

THE DEMOCRATIC ELEMENT IN THE NEW REPUBLICAN PARTY IN ILLINOIS, 1856-1860

By MILDRED C. STOLER*

On the night of November 2, 1852, Democrats all over the United States were jubilant. Early returns from the presidential election held that day indicated the certain election of Franklin Pierce, their candidate. Thus the country was to return once more to its old allegiance, broken only twice—by Harrison in 1840 and Taylor in 1848—since the first election of Andrew Jackson.

Underneath the surface, however, all was far from well. Discerning observers knew that the party was plagued by internal forces which might easily disrupt it. There were the Free Soilers who had returned to the party after leaving it in 1848, an element which demanded federal grants for internal improvements, advocates of a Homestead Bill, and the supporters of state prohibition of intoxicating liquors (the "Maine Law" movement). Moreover, the Democracy was the victim of its own successes. Factions developed on questions of patronage and leadership. Since the Whigs proved to be so weak in 1853, some Democrats prophesied that such factions might easily develop into something serious. "The Democratic party," said *Chapman's Chanticleer* of Indianapolis on January 19, 1854, "can no more hold together after the pressure of its antagonism to Whiggery is removed, than a tub will stay whole after the hoops are gone." Furthermore, beginning in 1854, there was an outburst of antiforeign feeling (the Know Nothings) which levied its toll in the Democratic as well as in the Whig ranks.

This being the situation into which Stephen A. Douglas launched his Kansas-Nebraska Bill, it is not surprising that a permanent insurgency developed in the Democratic Party. By repealing the Missouri Compromise, Congress gave up its claim to the power to prohibit slavery in Kansas and Nebraska and, to all intents and purposes, in all other territories. A great wave of protest swept the North resulting in a

* Instructor in European History, Wilson Teachers College, Washington, D. C.

mass movement[1] which after two years culminated in the organization of the Republican Party. In the new party the Whigs furnished the mass of voters, but the Democratic element was often accorded the highest posts within the gift of the party. Moreover, that element furnished many of the finest debaters and organizers in the new party, and often it was the votes of Democratic insurgents, or those who had previously voted the Democratic ticket, which turned the balance at the polls in favor of the Republican candidates.

Until the summer of 1856 the future of this anti-Nebraska movement was by no means assured. In Illinois there was no central organization whatever in 1854. The anti-Nebraska men elected to the legislature were Whigs, anti-Nebraska Democrats, Free Soilers, and Know Nothings who had united temporarily in order to attain a common object, namely the voicing of their opposition to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. It was an open question whether a fusion of such diverse elements could be effected. Most anti-Nebraska Democrats and many Whigs were not eager to lose their party identity in a new party. This feeling was strong until the spring of 1856.

Meanwhile, the immediate task before them was the organization of the legislature and the election of a United States Senator. There were only three anti-Nebraska Democrats in the upper house and seven in the lower house. Yet one of them, Thomas J. Turner, was made speaker of the House, and two militant editors, George T. Brown and Charles H. Ray, received offices in the Senate.[2] The election of Brown and Ray was not only a real victory for the anti-Nebraska men in general, but also for the insurgent Democrats who prevented the Democratic majority in the Senate from electing their caucus candidates. This they did by co-operating with the anti-Nebraska Whigs and Free Soilers.[3]

The insurgent Democrats also obtained the greatest prize of all—the United States Senator. This they did by refusing to vote for any

---

[1] For an account of the movement in Illinois in 1854 see Mildred C. Stoler, "Insurgent Democrats of Indiana and Illinois in 1854," *Indiana Magazine of History*, XXXIII, no. 1 (March, 1937), 1-31. That article and the present one are slightly modified parts of the author's doctoral dissertation (filed in Indiana University Library), "The Influence of the Democratic Element in the Republican Party of Illinois and Indiana, 1854-1860."

[2] Brown was editor of the Alton *Courier* and Ray of the Galena *Jeffersonian*.

[3] The other three officers were pro-Nebraska Democrats but not the choice of the caucus. Trumbull to John M. Palmer, Alton, Nov. 23, 1854, "Collection of Letters from Lyman Trumbull to John M. Palmer, 1854-1858," edited by George Thomas Palmer, *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, Vol. XVI, nos. 1-2 (April-June, 1923), 22; *Illinois State Register* [Springfield], Jan. 4, 1855.

one save Lyman Trumbull, an anti-Nebraska Democrat recently elected to Congress from the eighth district.[4] Five of them refused all overtures for fusion.[5] They told the Whigs that it was best to fight fire with fire, that is, to send an anti-Douglas Democrat to sit with Douglas in the Senate. To elect a Whig, they argued, would not add to the strength of the anti-Nebraska movement, but to choose an anti-Nebraska Democrat would draw thousands of Democrats away from their party.[6]

The first ballot showed the strategic position of the five "stalwarts." Lincoln, candidate of the anti-Nebraska caucus, led with forty-five; James A. Shields, candidate of the Democrats, was second with forty-one; Trumbull received the votes of the five staunch anti-Nebraska Democrats. Fifty votes were necessary for a choice. Had the five insurgents consented to vote for a Whig, which they refused to do, Lincoln could have been elected. On the following ballots Lincoln's vote gradually dwindled until on the ninth it was reduced to fifteen loyal Whigs who would vote for no one else. Trumbull gained most of the changed votes. But the Democrats, now supporting Governor Joel A. Matteson, were within two votes of victory. At this juncture Lincoln released the fifteen loyal Whigs and so ensured Trumbull's election.[7] Thus did a little band of five determined anti-Nebraska

---

[4] "Address of Gen. John M. Palmer," *Transactions of the McLean County Historical Society* (Bloomington, Ill., 1900), III: 122.

[5] Sen. John M. Palmer had recently been elected as an independent candidate while Burton C. Cook of LaSalle County and Norman B. Judd of Cook County were holdover senators who preferred to pursue an independent course. Acting with them were George T. Allen and Henry S. Baker, anti-Nebraska Democratic representatives from Madison County.

[6] See statement by a Whig state representative given in Horace White, *The Life of Lyman Trumbull* (Boston, 1913), 46-47n. This position was approved by Trumbull and by George T. Brown of the Alton *Courier*. Trumbull to John M. Palmer, Alton, Nov. 23, 1854, *Jour. Ill. State Hist. Soc.*, April-June, 1923, p. 22; Alton *Courier* [daily], Jan. 1, 1855. Dr. Charles H. Ray likewise favored an anti-Nebraska Democrat, but he was more willing to support a Whig than were the five "stalwarts." At first he was prejudiced against Lincoln because of the latter's southern connections, which Ray felt might make him too conservative on the slavery issue, but after a conference with Lincoln his fears were allayed and he lent his influence to Lincoln's election. See C. H. Ray to [Washburne], North Norwich, N.Y., Dec. 16, 24, 1854, and Jan. 12, 1855, Elihu B. Washburne Collection (MSS, Library of Congress). Robert H. Foss, George F. Foster, Thomas J. Turner, and Mathias L. Dunlap, known to have been elected as Republicans, and G. D. A. Parks voted for Lincoln oftener than for any other although they were of Democratic antecedents. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, 1855,* 348-61.

[7] Lincoln to Hon. W. H. Henderson, Springfield, Feb. 21, 1855, J. W. Templeton, "Life and Services of General Thomas J. Henderson," *Jour. Ill. State Hist. Soc.,* Vol. IV, no. 1 (April, 1911), 73; *House Journal, Illinois, 1855,* 348-61; *Per-*

Democrats overrule a number nine times as great.

Lyman Trumbull had a trained legal mind, and was without question an able lawyer and judge. Although he lacked the oratorical power of a Carl Schurz, his cold logic and carefully prepared argument impressed his hearers with his sincerity. He was not radical enough on the slavery question to suit the Free Soilers,[8] but this made him all the more acceptable to the timid conservatives who abhorred anyone tinged with abolitionism. He had had considerable political experience, and for the next eighteen years he was to serve as United States Senator. From this position he was able to exert great influence in the formation and consolidation of the Republican Party in Illinois.[9]

Trumbull's election was significant as an anti-Nebraska victory and as a humiliation for the Democratic Party. It was a bitter dose, indeed, for Douglas to have an anti-Nebraska Democrat as a colleague.[10] But of even greater import than these was the fact that Trumbull occupied a strategic position for organizing the opposition to Douglas within his own party. He conducted an educational campaign by sending thousands of documents into the state in an attempt to win Democrats away from the "Little Giant."[11] Furthermore, he was constantly alert for opportunities to keep alive the controversy over the constitutionality of the popular sovereignty doctrine. He also early demonstrated his ability to debate, as well as the courage and clarity with which he was to defend the moderate antislavery position. His attack on the Kansas report, which Douglas made in March, 1856, was hailed with delighted approval by opponents of Douglas as a harbinger of the future strength-

---

sonal Recollections of John M. Palmer (Cincinnati, 1901), 71-72; Lincoln to E. B. Washburne, Springfield, Feb. 9, 1855, John G. Nicolay and John Hay, eds., *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln* (Gettysburg ed.; New York, 1905), II: 274.

[8] C. H. Ray to [Washburne], Springfield, Jan. 2, 1854 [*1855*], Washburne Col.

[9] For various estimates of Trumbull see Alton *Courier,* Sept. 14, 1854, and Feb. 2, 1855, quoting other papers; Thomas J. McCormack, ed., *Memoirs of Gustave Koerner, 1809-1896* (Cedar Rapids, Ia., 1909), I: 425-26; John Moses, *Illinois, Historical and Statistical* (2nd. rev. ed.; Chicago, 1895), II: 594; Charles P. Johnson, "Personal Recollections of Some of the Eminent Statesmen and Lawyers of Illinois," *Transactions of the Illinois State Historical Society for the Year 1904* (Springfield, 1904), 43-47; J. L. Lester to Trumbull, Greenville, Ill., March 25, 1856, Lyman Trumbull Col. (MSS, Lib. Cong.).

[10] In the estimation of a friend of Douglas, the Illinois Democracy received a most severe blow when a "traitor" to the party was sent to the Senate. J. W. Sheahan to [Douglas], Chicago, Feb. 8, 1855, Stephen A. Douglas Col. (MSS, Univ. of Chicago).

[11] *Ill. State Register,* Jan. 30, 1856. For many requests for documents see Trumbull Col., March 31 to May 12, 1856.

ening of the anti-Nebraska cause.[12] Thus, in the unremitting warfare between regular and "renegade" Democrats, the insurgents were in an excellent position to give blow for blow.

In addition, Trumbull's election was significant because it paved the way for the fusion of the anti-Nebraska Democrats with most of the Whigs.[13] His election by their combined votes brought the two groups closer together. Although Trumbull considered himself a Democrat, he was nevertheless the representative of all the anti-Nebraska men by virtue of their timely aid. Furthermore, Lincoln's decision to withdraw from the race in Trumbull's favor rather than to permit the election of a Douglas Democrat gave the anti-Nebraska Democrats some confidence that they need not be a "baffled faction at the tail of an alien organization," but could become "the bone and sinew" of a new party, even though they were a minority.[14] Moreover, the fact that they had a Senator would give the group real prestige in a new party. Thus the election of Trumbull was not only an important step in the evolution of the anti-Nebraska Democrats from mere insurgency to membership in a new party, but it made possible their ascendancy in that party in 1856.

Little interest was shown in fusion until the spring of 1856. Many anti-Nebraska Democrats continued to insist stoutly that they were the "true" Democrats and that they would "dethrone" Douglas and "purify" the party of its proslavery principles.[15] Others, despairing of this, merely awaited developments which might determine their future course.[16] The sense of partisanship was still too strong to admit of har-

---

[12] Salmon P. Chase, governor of Ohio, thought its logic was "irresistible" and rejoiced that Illinois had sent him to the Senate. George T. Brown said that the "northern part of the State, which was in doubt" earlier as to his course, had experienced a "general shaking hands and rejoicing." The St. Louis *Intelligencer* was of the opinion that he approached "more nearly to the late John C. Calhoun, of S.C., in the analytic clearness and logical power of his mind," than any other senator, and declared that Douglas had met his match in Lyman Trumbull. See letters to Trumbull from Chase, Columbus, April 14, 1856, J. M. Palmer, Carlinville, March 24, 1856, Brown, Alton, March 29, 1856, Grant Goodrich (Whig), Chicago, March 28, 1856—Trumbull Col.; St. Louis *Intelligencer* quoted in Quincy *Whig* (weekly), March 29, 1856; Horace White, *Life of Trumbull*, 66-67.

[13] Lincoln to [George W.] Dole, *et al.*, Springfield, Dec. 14, 1859, Lincoln Col. (MSS, Chicago Hist. Soc.).

[14] J. M. Palmer to Lyman Trumbull, Carlinville, May 25, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[15] *Daily Democratic Press* [Chicago], Oct. 20, Nov. 20, 1854, July 21, Aug. 27, 1855; Belleville *Advocate,* copied in *Illinois Journal* [Springfield, daily], July 24, 1855. Koerner refused to abandon his party until it had closed every door to his further co-operation with it by upholding the Douglas doctrine in the national convention. Palmer and Wentworth shared his views. Koerner, *Memoirs,* II: 3-4; letter of Palmer quoted in *ibid.,* 5; *Ill. State Register,* April 9, 1856.

[16] Letters to Trumbull from George T. Allen, Alton, Jan. 19, 1856, and David

monious co-operation. Each group of anti-Nebraska men desired the others to join it, but was not willing as yet to lose its identity in a new party. Trumbull explained this attitude in a letter to Owen Lovejoy in which he said:

> I see & feel the want of concerted action among those who entertain this sentiment [against the spread of slavery]; but whether it would be advisable at this time to call a state convention of all those opposed to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, irrespective of party, is very questionable. In this part of the state [near St. Louis] there is so much party feeling, so great aversion to what is called *fusion,* that very few democrats would be likely to unite in a convention composed of all parties. If a convention of the Democracy, opposed equally to the spread of slavery, to abolition & to Know Nothingism, could be called, we could, I think, get a respectable representation from this part of the state, and such a movement would probably damage the Nebraska democracy more than anything else which could be done; but I do not presume any considerable portion of the North would unite in a convention of this kind. In order to carry this state, we must keep out of the pro-slavery party a large number of those who are democrats. There would be no difficulty in doing this, were it not for old party associations, & side issues, such as Know Nothingism & the Temperance question.[17]

Early in 1856, however, the anti-Nebraska men began to look more favorably upon fusion. The developments of the previous year had convinced many insurgent Democrats that they would have to abandon their party completely. As it became apparent that the question of slavery extension was to be the issue in the next campaign, they felt that there was no longer any middle ground. Their choice lay between a national policy favoring slavery or one favoring freedom, and since it seemed to them that the Democracy favored slavery by upholding the Kansas-Nebraska Act, the only course left to them was to leave the party permanently. Therefore, as their convictions on this point deepened and the need for organizing for the fall election became more pressing, their partisan loyalty weakened.[18] The choice by a fusion party in Ohio of an antislavery Democrat, Salmon P. Chase, as candi-

---

L. Phillips, Anna, Ill., Jan. 18, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[17] Aug. 23, 1855 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib., Springfield). See also Silas Ramsey to Trumbull, Lacon, Ill., March 7, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[18] John H. Bryant to Trumbull, Princeton, Ill., March 24, 1856; John Trible to Trumbull, Alton, Jan. 25, 1856; Silas Ramsey to Trumbull, Lacon, Ill., March 7, 1856; George T. Brown to [Trumbull], Alton, Jan. 28, 1856—Trumbull Col.

date for governor, and his election in 1855, may also have influenced some to support fusion.

Trumbull, himself, was willing to join the Republicans provided they would "abandon their altruisms" and stand upon the single issue of opposition to the spread of slavery into free territory. He was careful, however, to say, "When I speak of the Republicans I do not mean such as have assumed that name in Illinois and who oppose the fugitive slave law, [and] the admission of any more slave states under any circumstances."[19] Some of the Whigs held the same view.[20]

The Illinois fusion movement was initiated on February 22, 1856, by the Decatur editorial convention. Three anti-Nebraska Democratic papers—*Illinois Staats-Zeitung* at Chicago, Aurora *Guardian,* and Belleville *Advocate*—were among the more than twenty-five papers which endorsed the meeting.[21] A heavy snowstorm prevented a full attendance, but of the twelve who arrived, two were Democrats—Dr. Charles H. Ray, who had transferred from the Galena *Jeffersonian* to the Chicago *Tribune,*[22] and George Schneider of the *Staats-Zeitung.*

Ray and Schneider exerted considerable influence on the formulation of the resolutions and indirectly upon the party platform of 1856, for the Decatur resolutions became the basis for those later drawn up at Bloomington. The editorial convention adopted the position of the anti-Nebraska Democrats and moderate Whigs rather than the more extreme ground of the "Republicans" of 1854. The rights of the South, as interpreted by conservative northern sentiment, were recognized, and they insisted that the South should, in turn, respect the rights of the free states. But there was no demand for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Act, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the prohibition of slavery in *all* territories, or the admission of no slaveholding state.[23] Upon such a platform anti-Nebraska Democrats and Whigs

[19] Trumbull to John M. Palmer, Washington, Jan. 24, 1856, *Jour. Ill. State Hist. Soc.,* April-June, 1923, p. 29.

[20] Letters to Trumbull from W. H. Herndon, Springfield, Feb. 15, March 8, 1856, and Dugger, Feb. 26, 1856, Trumbull Col. Dugger was editor of the *Logan County Forum* [Atlanta, Ill., weekly].

[21] The meeting was proposed by Paul Selby, Whig editor of the *Morgan Journal* [Jacksonville]. Paul Selby, "The Editorial Convention of 1856," *Jour. Ill. State Hist. Soc.,* Vol. V, no. 3 (Oct., 1912), 343-49, and Paul Selby, "The Editorial Convention, February 22, 1856," *Trans. McLean County Hist. Soc.,* 1900, p. 30-43.

[22] *Ill. State Register,* May 8, 1855. Simeon Whitely of the Aurora *Guardian* arrived in time to attend only the banquet following the meeting.

[23] *Illinois State Journal* [Springfield], Feb. 27, 1856. To prohibit slavery during the territorial period weighted the scales in favor of the free states.

alike could unite without any difficulty.

Schneider's influence can also be traced in the resolution which declared that no change should be made in the naturalization laws, and that birthplace should not be considered to be a qualification for office. The Know Nothing Party had made serious inroads on the anti-Nebraska strength, especially on the Whig element,[24] so it was necessary that the convention take some stand on nativism. Schneider, who represented the sentiment of thousands of German Democrats, stood firmly against any opportunist policy. In fact, he had endorsed the meeting only on the condition that no concessions be made to nativism.[25] He insisted that the new party had to choose between the German and Know Nothing vote since it could not have both. He prepared the resolution which was finally adopted not only by the editors but by the state convention a few months later.[26] Thus two anti-Nebraska Democrats left the imprint of their principles on the Republican platform of 1856.

Furthermore, four of the eleven members of the state central committee appointed by the editors were former Democrats. This shows how highly the Whig majority valued the Democratic element.[27]

The call for an anti-Nebraska state convention at Bloomington on May 29, 1856, brought to the surface various doubts and fears. Con-

---

[24] On Aug. 11, 1855, Lincoln wrote to Owen Lovejoy, "Until we can get the elements of this [Know Nothing] organization there is not sufficient material to successfully combat the Nebraska democracy with. . . . About us here, they are mostly my old political and personal friends." Gilbert A. Tracy, comp., *Uncollected Letters of Abraham Lincoln* (Boston, 1917), 59.

[25] *Morgan Journal,* Feb. 21, 1856.

[26] The choice was difficult since both Know Nothings and German Democrats had considerable strength. Finally, Lincoln was asked to decide the issue. He favored Schneider's plank. "Address by Hon. George Schneider," *Trans. McLean County Hist. Soc.,* 1900, p. 88-90. Paul Selby, Whig leader in this convention, writing fifty years later, said that Ray and Schneider "were controlling factors in framing the platform." Otto C. Schneider, "Abraham Lincoln und das Deutschthum," *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblatter,* VII, no. 2 (1907), 66.

[27] Gavion D. A. Parks, of Joliet, was one of the large group who had returned to the party after voting for Van Buren in 1848. He had been elected a state representative on an anti-Nebraska platform at the last election. *The United States Biographical Dictionary and Portrait Gallery of Eminent and Self-Made Men. Illinois Volume* (Chicago, 1876), 131. David L. Phillips, from the extreme southern part of the state, was an antislavery Democrat who had been one of the first to suggest Trumbull for the Senate. Newton Bateman and Paul Selby, eds., *Historical Encyclopedia of Illinois* (Chicago, 1901), I: 422; *Daily Democratic Press,* Sept. 8, 1854. William B. Ogden, of Chicago, and Lieut. Gov. Gustave Koerner declined to serve. Ogden found a substitute, Dr. John Evans, also an anti-Nebraska Democrat. J. Wesley Whicker, "Dr. John Evans," *Ind. Mag. of Hist.,* Vol. XIX, no. 3 (Sept., 1923), 226-40.

servatives wanted a "respectable" convention, one untinged by the stigma of abolitionism, so they set to work to obtain the attendance of the most prominent anti-Nebraska Whigs and Democrats. Any use of the name "Republican" was scrupulously avoided. However, the "Republicans" themselves came to the rescue by announcing that they would accept the platform and nominees made by the Whig and Democratic elements.[28]

On the other hand, some of the anti-Nebraska Democrats were also concerned over the possibility that the Whigs would want to control the fusion movement. The Whigs had taken the initiative in calling the Decatur convention and, although the Democratic element in that little group had exerted an influence out of proportion to their number, the Whigs would have to be given credit for taking the first step toward fusion. Moreover, the call for the Bloomington convention was made chiefly under their aegis because only three of the signers were anti-Nebraska Democrats. William H. Bissell, whose name was being widely considered for the gubernatorial nomination, wrote to Trumbull of his fears on this score. He said:

> I am inclined to think, with you, that the anti-Nebraska Democrats ought to have rallied, and taken the control and direction of this Bloomington Convention—made it, and its candidates, their own. Otherwise this Convention ought not to have been called, or held at all—but a candidate or candidates taken up and centered upon by general consent without the machinery of a convention.[29]

Both groups were troubled as to the attitude to be taken toward the Know Nothings since there was some doubt that the fusionists could succeed without their aid.[30] On the other hand there were some twenty thousand antislavery German Democrats who might, according to Ray, be won over if they were assured that the fusionists would not be friendly to the Know Nothings. Ray urged the adoption of the Decatur resolution recommending no change in the naturalization laws as one which would conciliate both groups.[31] He worked hard to get the Ger-

---

[28] Letters to Trumbull from Orville H. Browning, May 19, 1856, W. H. Herndon, April 24, May 17, 1856, George T. Brown, April 24, May 12, 1856, in Trumbull Col.; Chicago *Tribune* quoted in *Ill. State Register,* May 23, 1856.

[29] May 5, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[30] Lincoln to Owen Lovejoy, Springfield, Aug. 11, 1855, Tracy, *Uncollected Letters of Lincoln,* 59; J. C. Sloo (anti-Nebraska Democrat) to Trumbull, Shawneetown, Ill., May 16, 1856, Trumbull Col. The Americans put a separate ticket in the field.

[31] C. H. Ray to Trumbull, Chicago, March 21, 1856, Trumbull Col.

man vote. He advised Trumbull to talk to Representatives James Knox and Jesse O. Norton, whom he feared leaned unduly toward the Know Nothings, and when he heard a rumor that the latter planned to nominate Bissell, the probable anti-Nebraska candidate for governor, he took steps to prevent it. Such a nomination would give the Douglas Democrats a potent weapon, even as it had done in Indiana in 1854 and in the recent mayoralty election in Chicago.[32] The *Alton Courier, Belleville Advocate,* and *Chicago Democrat,* all in strong German settlements, opposed fusion with the American Party, and Gustave Koerner wrote anti-Nebraska articles for the German press.[33] Moreover, the Chicago *Democratic Press* made a friendly overture to the Germans by suggesting that Francis A. Hoffman be nominated for lieutenant governor.[34]

The least difficult of their problems was that of candidates. On this the anti-Nebraska Democrats took the initiative. On January 17, Ebenezer Peck[35] suggested to William H. Bissell, of Belleville, that he should become the anti-Douglas candidate for governor.[36] Bissell had long been very popular in his district. He was elected to Congress without opposition in 1848 and 1850 and in 1852 carried his district in spite of the fact that he ran as an Independent Democrat against a regular Democrat and a Whig. In 1851 he had suffered a partial paralytic stroke, and on the day of the final vote on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill he was too ill to be present but he offered to come if his vote would defeat the bill.[37] He had not entirely recovered his health by 1856, but so great was his popularity that his name, once suggested, was hailed by the anti-Nebraska men as one which could certainly lead them to victory.

The anti-Nebraska Democratic paper of his home town, the *Belleville Advocate,* prophesied his election "by such an overwhelming ma-

---

[32] Ray to Washburne, Chicago, May 4, [1856], Washburne Col.; *Ill. State Register,* Feb. 15, March 7, 1856.

[33] Alton *Courier,* copied in *Daily Democratic Press,* May 14, 1856; *Ill. State Register,* Feb. 7, 1856; George T. Brown to Trumbull, Alton, April 24, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[34] *Illinois Staats-Zeitung,* translation copied in the *Daily Democratic Press,* May 23, 1856; *Ill. State Jour.,* quoting *Daily Democratic Press,* May 21, 1856.

[35] Peck was an able Chicago lawyer who had been a state representative and clerk and reporter of the Supreme Court. John M. Palmer, *Bench and Bar of Illinois* (Chicago, 1899), I: 76-77, II: 627.

[36] W. H. Bissell to E. Peck, Belleville, Jan. 21, 1856 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.).

[37] *Trans. Ill. State Hist. Soc., 1904,* pp. 47-58.

jority as will make the heads of the Neb-raskals swim!"[38] His nomination "by the people" was endorsed by the *Alton Courier, Chicago Democrat,* and *Democratic Press.* James C. Sloo, anti-Nebraska Democrat of Shawneetown, told Trumbull that Bissell could easily carry Gallatin County in lower "Egypt," while Silas Ramsey, of Lacon in north central Illinois, and Charles Ray in Chicago, were satisfied that he could be elected.[39] Koerner, too, favored Bissell even though his own name was suggested by some.[40] But perhaps the best evidence of his strength as a candidate was the fact that the Douglas men believed him to be a real danger to their success, especially because he was impervious to certain campaign ammunition. One of them wrote:

> The only danger we have to fear is that the Republicans will nominate Bissle [*sic*], in which event our German vote may be endangered—We cannot persuade them that Bissle is not a Democrat and with a Catholic wife Know-Nothingism won't take a good hold upon him.[41]

Bissell's nomination was approved by the anti-Nebraska Whigs with an enthusiasm equal to that of the Democratic insurgents. Lincoln advocated the nomination of an anti-Nebraska Democrat on the ground that more votes could be secured by such a candidate than by an old-line Whig, and he named Bissell as his choice. The *Illinois Journal, Quincy Whig,* and Chicago *Tribune* also favored him. Abraham Jonas, of Quincy, and Joseph Gillespie, of Edwardsville, both Whigs, assured Trumbull that with Bissell victory was certain.[42]

The anti-Nebraska Democrats were very active in the work of rallying the interest of the insurgents in the Bloomington convention. George T. Brown, Alton, promised Trumbull that his county would

[38] Belleville *Advocate* quoted in *Ill. State Jour.,* March 4, 1856; *Ill. State Jour.,* April 1, 1856; *Daily Democratic Press,* May 14, 20, 1856; *Ill. State Register,* March 6, 1856. George T. Brown told Trumbull on April 24, 1856, "With Bissell, we can beat any Nebraskaite for Governor and if we can get the balance of the ticket, of good men, I think Illinois is perfectly safe." Trumbull Col.

[39] Letters of April 18, March 7, and May 4, Trumbull Col. Ramsey had been one of the vice-presidents of the Democratic state convention in 1852 but had opposed the Nebraska Bill and was read out of the party in 1854. *Ill. State Register* [weekly], April 22, 1852; *Daily Democratic Press,* Oct. 3, 1854; *Ill. State Jour.,* Oct. 6, 11, 1854.

[40] Thos. Quick to Trumbull, Belleville, Jan. 24, 1856, Trumbull Col. For the movement in favor of Koerner, see letters to Trumbull from [John] Reynolds, Feb. 15, 1856, and H. Barber, Richview, Ill., Jan. 30, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[41] J. D. Morrison to S. A. Douglas, Belleville, April 16, 1856, Douglas Col.

[42] *Jour. Ill. State Hist. Soc.,* Oct., 1912, p. 347. Selby was a member of this convention. *Ill. Jour.,* March 4, 1856; Quincy *Whig* [weekly], March 29, 1856, copying Chicago *Tribune;* letters to Trumbull, Feb. 2, 9, 11, 1856, Trumbull Col.

have a strong delegation to send. He and B. J. F. Hanna organized an anti-Nebraska club, talked to the many foreign residents of Madison County, and organized meetings for the purpose of sending delegates to Bloomington from neighboring counties. In order to lend that "respectability" which they so much desired, they secured the promise of attendance from such Whig leaders as Stephen T. Logan, Richard Yates, and Abraham Lincoln, and also the anti-Nebraska Democratic editor of the *Belleville Advocate,* Nathaniel Niles. Another insurgent, L. J. S. Turney, spent ten days in some of the southern counties urging anti-Nebraska men to send delegates.[43] T. C. Moore, a Democratic state representative in 1851, presided over a meeting in Peoria County which named delegates. George R. Weber, who later laid claim to being the first Democrat in Sangamon County to raise the Republican banner, was a vice-president of the meeting in that county, and made a fiery speech showing how Douglas had departed "from old fashioned national Democracy."[44]

Trumbull, too, wrote letters to many anti-Nebraska leaders, advising and urging them to send delegates, and he found most of them willing to co-operate.[45] In the northern counties, Norman B. Judd held conferences with leading anti-Nebraska Democrats. He reported to Trumbull on May 15:

> All of our leading Anti-Nebraska Democrats are for the Bloomington Convention and the only trouble will be to get them rallied. [Burton C.] Cook & [James] Knox and his friends will help beat the Nebraska ticket, although I could not persuade him to be a candidate for any thing or to go to the convention.—I have talked with a large number of men from the interior—The feeling of many of Douglas's supporters is a deep hostility to his Kansas operations and if they build a Southern platform and put a Southern man on it there will be a stampede—I am going to day to see if I can get [John L.] Scripps [of the *Democratic Press*] to write a leader in favor of the Bloomington Convention—I have not talked with Wentworth . . . . If I can find time this week I am going to see

[43] Letters to Trumbull from Brown, May 12, 1856, and Turney, July 29, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[44] *Daily Democratic Press,* May 27, 1856; Ameda Ruth King, "The Last Years of the Whig Party in Illinois, 1847-1856," *Trans. Ill. State Hist. Soc., 1925,* p. 144; George R. Weber to Trumbull, Springfield, Feb. 25, 1861, Trumbull Col.; *Ill. State Jour.,* May 26, 1856. The *Ill. State Register,* May 26, 1856, said sarcastically, "Mr. Weber's thrusts, being a deserter to Van Buren in '48, were the most ferocious."

[45] For example, see W. Kitchell to Trumbull, Hillsboro, May 25, 1856, and J. C. Sloo to Trumbull, Shawneetown, May 16, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[William B.] Plato and then to Dixon and see some men there.[46]

The efforts of Judd and George T. Brown were not in vain because in the county conventions the anti-Nebraska Democrats showed most activity and influence in Chicago and Alton. In the Cook County convention, Francis C. Sherman and Hermann Kreismann, both insurgents, were chosen chairman and secretary, respectively. Speeches were made by John Wentworth, Sherman, Mark Skinner, and John F. Farnsworth, all anti-Nebraska Democrats, and by one Whig. Dr. John Evans, member of the state central committee appointed at Decatur, was present. The resolutions were prepared by Wentworth. Of the seventeen delegates sent to the state convention from Cook County, ten, or more than half, were Democratic insurgents.[47]

Madison County, in which Alton lies, sent as delegates four anti-Nebraska Democrats—F. S. Rutherford, George T. Brown, John Trible, and Henry S. Baker.[48] The insurgents of Marion County (this was not a fusion meeting) sent three anti-Nebraska Democrats.[49] Other delegations included only one or two of the faction.[50]

---

[46] Trumbull Col. Plato was Democratic state senator from 1849 to 1854; Cook was one of the state senators who refused to vote for anyone except Trumbull for United States senator in 1855; Glover had been a Democratic state representative from LaSalle County in 1846; Knox had been a Democratic member of the state constitutional convention in 1847.

[47] *Daily Democratic Press,* May 23, 24, 1856. For a list of the delegates who attended the Bloomington convention, see "Official Record of Convention," *Trans. McLean County Hist. Soc.,* 1900, pp. 148-64. The insurgents from Cook County were Ray, Schneider, Scripps, Wentworth, Sherman, Skinner, Judd, Isaac N. Arnold, Samuel Hoard, and James Michie. There may have been others. The political affiliation of five delegates has not been established. Ebenezer Peck was not a delegate, because "Wentworth, who was a fugler" in the county convention "was so hostile," but he planned to be at Bloomington to meet the delegates as they arrived and to try to promote harmony and "secure discreet action." E. Peck to Trumbull, Chicago, May 26, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[48] There were four others whose party affiliation has not been learned.

[49] T. F. Houts to Trumbull, Salem, May 19, 1856, Trumbull Col.; *Ill. State Jour.,* May 23, 1856. The delegates were Dr. D. K. Green, T. W. Jones, and S. W. Cunningham.

[50] John M. Palmer and P. B. Solomon (Macoupin), Wickliffe Kitchell, father of Edward Kitchell (Montgomery), Nathaniel Niles and Francis Wenzell, editor of the Belleville *Zeitung* (St. Clair), B. J. F. Hanna (Randolph), Edward Kitchell (Richland), D. L. Phillips (Union), Elisha P. Ferry (Lake), G. D. A. Parks and Samuel Anderson (Will), Burton C. Cook (LaSalle), John H. Bryant (Bureau), William Prothrow (Whiteside), and William B. Powers (Adams). Bryant was elected Democratic state representative in 1842 and was the defeated Free Soil candidate for Congress in 1852. Theodore C. Pease, ed., *Illinois Election Returns, 1818-1848 (Illinois Historical Collections,* XVIII, Springfield, 1923), 482. Powers, of Quincy, had been a Democratic member of the state constitutional convention of 1847. *Ibid.,* 558. These alone have been identified; there may have been other insurgents there.

The insurgents received important posts both in the convention and in the organization of the new party. The Whigs and "Republicans" recognized the validity of their claim that success could be obtained only by drawing away from the Douglas Democrats a large number of the moderate antislavery men. The most effective means of doing this was to elevate the insurgents to positions of leadership. This policy reacted to the advantage of the new party in two ways. In the first place, it thus bound to itself, with the strong bonds of a vested interest, men of great organizing ability like Norman B. Judd; militant editors such as Ray and Brown; and such recognized leaders of the Democracy as Palmer and Wentworth. To be able to claim these men, together with Bissell, Koerner, Thomas J. Turner, and others, gave the new movement the prestige which was essential to success. In the second place, it was probable that many other Democrats would be influenced by the example of these prominent men in deciding to throw in their lot with the new party.

The "Anti-Nebraska" state convention at Bloomington was called to order on the morning of May 29 by George T. Brown. He suggested the name of a Whig for temporary chairman, but he and Henry S. Baker served as secretaries. The permanent officers included the names of at least eight anti-Nebraska Democrats: John M. Palmer presided over the convention, five of the thirteen vice-presidents were insurgents, as well as the two secretaries.[51] Leaders from both Democratic insurgent and Whig elements frequently claimed the floor. It was a Whig who nominated Bissell for governor. Immediately, Brown read a letter from Bissell saying that he would accept the nomination if made. Without further ceremony, he was made the party nominee by acclamation. Then Nathaniel Niles nominated Francis A. Hoffman for the second place on the ticket and he, too, was acclaimed the nominee without a formal vote by the enthusiastic delegates. One other Democratic insurgent was placed on the ticket: William H. Powell was nominated for the office of state superintendent of public instruction. The candidates for secretary of state, auditor, and treasurer were Whigs.[52] It is significant that the "Republicans," who had controlled the fusion movement in 1854, were given no place whatever on the ticket in 1856. The conservatism so much desired by both the other elements was attained.

[51] The vice-presidents were G. D. A. Parks, James Michie, J. H. Bryant, John Clark, and D. L. Phillips. The secretaries were Baker and B. J. F. Hanna.

[52] Ozias M. Hatch, Jesse K. Dubois, and James Miller.

The Democratic element was also recognized in Palmer's appointments of committees. Wentworth, David L. Phillips, and Trible helped to select the presidential electors.[53] For these key positions in the campaign the committee chose five Whigs, four former Democrats, and two whose political antecedents are unknown.[54] The resolutions committee was composed of four from the Democratic element, three from the Whig ranks, and one Free Soiler.[55] Moreover, the Democratic element was given a majority on the important state central committee which was made up of three former Democrats and two former Whigs.[56] That element also had its full share and more, if number of delegates is considered, of the orators. The convention heard Palmer, Wentworth, and Cook. But Lincoln carried off the honors of the day with his so-called "lost speech." He held his audience as if by some hypnotic power, rendering his hearers "at times hushed and breathless" but again arousing them to wild cheers. So enthralled were they that the reporters failed to get notes, and so the speech was lost to posterity.[57]

Obviously, the anti-Nebraska Democrats had been given the most prominent posts within the gift of the party—the presidency of the convention, the nominees for governor, lieutenant governor,[58] superintendent of public instruction, and a majority of the state central committee. They were not a "baffled faction" in the old Whig Party as they had feared they might be, but leaders in the new party.

---

[53] The political antecedents of Wesley Diggins have not been learned. He voted for Lincoln on the first four ballots in the senatorial election of 1855 and for Ogden, an anti-Nebraska Democrat, on the next four. The other five members of the committee were Whigs. Of the committee to nominate state officers, six were Whigs; the party to which the other three had belonged is not known, but from Palmer's other appointments it may be inferred that one or more of them were Democratic insurgents. They were W. W. Orme from the third district, Thomas McClurken from the eighth, and Benjamin T. Wiley from the ninth.

[54] E. P. Ferry, unsuccessful anti-Nebraska Democratic candidate for Congress in 1854, was selected to organize the campaign in the first district. Friend S. Rutherford was put in command in the eighth and D. L. Phillips in the ninth district. Lincoln, a Whig, and Frederick Hecker, a leader among the German Democrats, were made electors-at-large.

[55] Judd, Wickliffe Kitchell, Phillips, and George Walbrecht were Democrats; Samuel C. Parks, Browning, and Abner C. Harding were Whigs; and Owen Lovejoy was a Free Soiler.

[56] The Democrats were Judd, Ray, and Burton C. Cook.

[57] *Ill. State Register,* May 31, 1856; *Daily Democratic Press,* May 31, 1856; Moses, *Illinois, Historical and Statistical,* II: 600-601.

[58] Hoffman withdrew his name when it was found that he was ineligible because the state constitution required officials to have been citizens for fourteen years, whereas he had been naturalized in 1846. *Ill. State Jour.,* July 26, 1856. A Whig was selected to fill the vacancy. *Ibid.,* Sept. 25, 1856.

As in the case of the nominees, the resolutions lacked the radical tendency of the "Republicans." They reiterated their belief that Congress had constitutional authority for legislating on slavery in the territories and they promised to use that power to prohibit slavery in Kansas and Nebraska if they had the opportunity. They advocated the immediate admission of Kansas as a free state under the Topeka Constitution. By declaring that no one should be proscribed because of religious opinions or in consequence of birthplace, they sought to make the platform acceptable to the Germans, who were represented on the committee by George Walbrecht and Vincenz. On the other hand, they did not denounce the Know Nothings and thereby hoped to conciliate them. This, it will be recalled, was the view of the Decatur convention, and the one so earnestly supported by C. H. Ray.[59]

In the selection of candidates for members of the national House of Representatives, the Democratic element was again given more recognition than its size warranted. In three districts a former Democrat was chosen.[60] John M. Palmer was urged to run for Congress in the sixth district, and the fusion convention even nominated him, but he persistently refused. He felt that he, as an anti-Nebraska Democrat, could not win because he could not get the votes of the strong Whig and American elements in his district. Some of the Whigs objected to him on the ground that there were already enough former Democrats on the state ticket and among the presidential electors.[61]

The Democratic element also furnished seven of the thirty-four delegates from Illinois to the Philadelphia national convention. Of these, five had an active part in the work of the convention.[62]

---

[59] Theodore C. Pease and James G. Randall, eds., *The Diary of Orville Hickman Browning (Illinois Historical Collections,* XX, Springfield, 1925), I: 237-39.

[60] In the second district, the Democratic element was prominent as shown by the fact that seven of the element received votes. Five of these were not candidates for the nomination. John F. Farnsworth was chosen. *Daily Democratic Press,* Sept. 27, 1856. Thomas C. Sharp was nominated in the fifth district. He had been a member of the state constitutional convention in 1847. *Ill. State Jour.,* copying the *Pike County Free Press,* Sept. 24, 1856. John Thomas, Democratic member of the General Assembly in 1838, was nominated in the eighth district. *Ill. State Jour.,* Sept. 20, 1856.

[61] John Trible to [Trumbull], Alton, Ill., May 15, 1856, letters to Trumbull from G. T. Brown, Alton, June 3, 1856, and W. H. Herndon, Springfield, July 29, 1856, Trumbull Col.; Trumbull to John M. Palmer, May 21, 1856, *Jour. Ill. State Hist. Soc.,* April-June, 1923, p. 30; J. M. Palmer to Richard Yates, Carlinville, July 29, 1856 (Miscellaneous MSS—Reavis, Chicago Hist. Soc.).

[62] Charles W. Johnson, ed., *Proceedings of the First Three Republican National Conventions* (Minneapolis, 1893), 41; George Schneider, "Address," *Trans. McLean County Hist. Soc.,* 1900, p. 90; Koerner, *Memoirs,* II: 14; Trumbull to

The fusionists emphasized "bleeding Kansas" in the campaign. Indeed, events in Kansas seemed to give substance to their allegation that the application of the popular sovereignty principle would result in the establishment of slavery. The attack in the United States Senate on Charles Sumner by Preston Brooks, following close on the heels of the sack of Lawrence, stirred the flames of sectional animosity, and materially aided the fusion party.

From his vantage place in the Senate, Trumbull sought to make ammunition for the campaign.[63] He offered an amendment to the Kansas Enabling Act explicitly interpreting the language of the Kansas-Nebraska Act as granting power to the territorial legislature to exclude or establish slavery. He thus tried to force Douglas to explain the exact meaning of the phrase, "to leave the people . . . free to . . . regulate their domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States." But Douglas merely refused to interpret the Constitution, saying that that was the function of the Supreme Court. Trumbull next introduced an amendment stating that slavery could not exist in Kansas unless a local law definitely provided for it. Douglas met this attack by holding Trumbull's amendment to be irrelevant in an enabling act, but in spite of this skillful evasion of the issue, his opponents did use his opposition to these amendments to his disadvantage in the campaign. In fact, much was made of this question.[64]

In the Chicago area, President Pierce's vetoes of bills for improving western rivers and harbors also became an issue. The *Democratic Press* alleged that the Administration put a strict construction on the Constitution when considering federal subsidies for internal improvements in the Northwest, but that it drove "over the whole instrument roughshod when the plot for slavery-extension" was at stake.[65] William Bross, one of the editors of the *Press,* stressed in his speeches the fact that

---

Lincoln, Washington, June 15, 1856 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.). The delegates were Brown, Judd, Palmer, Schneider, Francis Grimm, editor of the Belleville *Zeitung,* Hermann Kreismann of Chicago, and Edward R. Allen of Aurora. Trumbull and Koerner were present but not as delegates. Palmer was leader of the delegation, Judd was secretary of the national committee, Brown was on the resolutions committee, and Schneider was a secretary of the convention.

[63] Trumbull to Lincoln, Washington, June 15, July 5, 1856 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.).

[64] *Daily Democratic Press,* June 13, 1856. For the amendments, see *Appendix to the Cong. Globe,* 34 Cong., 1 Sess., 1855-1856, pp. 796-99. In 1858, Lincoln asked Douglas these very questions and in reply Douglas propounded the Freeport Doctrine.

[65] May 23, 1856.

Frémont favored internal improvements and a Pacific railroad.[66] Others used the same argument.

The Democratic element was active in the campaign. Nearly every one mentioned in this discussion participated. Bross and Schneider spoke not only in Illinois but in northern Indiana also. Frederick Hecker held German audiences in rapt attention with the "fire and energy" of his oratory,[67] and Gustave Koerner, too, was much in demand to speak in both German and English. Edward Kitchell began a new anti-Nebraska paper at Olney.[68] Trumbull was very assiduous in sending documents both to known partisans and to the wavering, and he also spoke in many places. He kept in touch with leaders from all elements in the party through their frequent reports to him, and made suggestions as to the best plan of campaign.[69] Although Judd and others made some effort to build an organization, little was accomplished in that direction. However, the enthusiasm of crusaders pervaded the ranks and offset somewhat their weakness in concerted action.[70]

The four northern districts elected Republican representatives to Congress but of these only Farnsworth was a former Democrat. The state ticket was successful. Bissell won a majority in the northern counties and in St. Clair, Madison, Edwards, and Wabash counties in the south. He was supported not only by fusionists but by thousands of Whigs, who later voted for Fillmore, the Know Nothing candidate, and by some anti-Douglas Democrats who supported Buchanan.[71]

---

[66] *Daily Democratic Press,* June 20, Sept. 10, 15, 1856.

[67] Thomas Quick told Trumbull on July 2, 1856, "Hecker is a magnificent speaker if one can judge from the effect he produces. I scarcely ever witnessed such applause as he received from his countrymen. His name however may have somewhat to do with that, but you can see that he is full of fire and energy." Trumbull Col.

[68] William Pickering to Trumbull, Edwards County, Ill., June 6, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[69] Letters to Trumbull from W. H. Herndon, Springfield, July 12, James C. Conkling, Springfield, Aug. 8, 1856, and J. R. Swain, Troy, Dec. 24, 1857, Trumbull Col.; Trumbull to Lincoln, Washington, July 5, 1856 (MSS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.).

[70] Koerner and Judd both complained of the lack of organization and the latter wrote to Trumbull, "What we want just now is just such a person as you to give form and organization to the contest." Aug. 3, 1856, Trumbull Col. See also Koerner to Trumbull, July 29, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[71] The Quincy *Herald,* a Democratic organ, blamed the Fillmore men for the defeat of Richardson, the American candidate for governor, who received about 19,000 votes while Fillmore polled 37,500. Since the Democratic vote for president was only about 1,200 less than for governor, Bissell obviously did receive a large part of the Fillmore vote. The number of Democrats who voted for Bissell and Buchanan probably was too small to influence the result. That there existed such

LIBRARY

In the presidential election the Republicans were defeated. However, out of thirty-five Illinois counties giving majorities to Frémont, the Democratic element was the decisive factor in ten cases.[72] Thus the new party was deeply indebted to its Democratic element.

The new party was not the old Whig Party with a new name, but a fusion of Whigs, anti-Nebraska Democrats, and Free Soilers. The traditional principles of each were suppressed for the time being, and those on which all could agree were upheld. The majority element, which was Whig, had recognized the need for weakening the Democracy by deepening the schism in its ranks, and so had raised anti-Nebraska Democrats to prominent positions in the new party. Indeed, until the latter were assured of such recognition, they were reluctant to join the fusion movement. They wanted to be the "bone and sinew" of the Republican Party and not an insignificant, disregarded faction. They were granted their desire in 1856. The next question was, could they maintain this ascendancy.

When, early in 1858, it appeared that the opposition of Douglas and many other Democrats to the Lecompton Constitution would cause a new schism among the Democrats, the Republicans were delighted.[73] But their joy soon changed to anxiety as it developed that many Republicans sympathized with Douglas.[74] Would the Democratic element

---

a group was noted by the *Ill. State Register,* July 10, 1856, and by M. W. Delahay in a letter to Trumbull, July 23, 1856, Trumbull Col.

[72] This can be demonstrated by the calculation of the approximate decrease in the strength of the Democratic vote of 1856 based on estimates derived from the results in 1852. St. Clair County may be taken as an example. The county's total vote increased by 1,128 during the four years between elections. Normally the vote of each party might be expected to increase in proportion to the percentage of the total vote which was its share in 1852. In 1852 the Democrats polled 72 per cent of the total vote. If they had received 72 per cent of the increase in votes (1,128), Buchanan should have received 812 to Pierce's 316, or an estimated total of 3,383. Actually he received only 1,728 or an estimated loss of 1,657 votes. If this number is subtracted from Frémont's vote of 1,996, it is found that normally Frémont would have had only 339 votes, or less than the number actually cast for the Democratic candidate. Thus without the 1,657 votes which the Democrats might normally have polled, the Republicans could not have carried the county. The author is indebted to Professor William O. Lynch for this method of computation which he used in his study on "The Convergence of Lincoln and Douglas," *Trans. of the Ill. State Hist. Soc., 1925,* p. 157 n.

[73] Tracy, *Uncollected Letters,* 82; Charles S. Wilson, Dec. 14, 1857, and Samuel C. Parks, Dec. 26, 1857, Trumbull Col.; Trumbull to W. C. Flagg, Washington, Jan. 8, 1858 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.).

[74] Charles Wilson, editor of the Chicago *Daily Journal,* to Trumbull, Nov. 26, 1857, and William H. Herndon to Trumbull, Springfield, April 24, 1858, Trumbull Col.

in the new party remain steadfast or would it follow Douglas?[75] Undoubtedly there was something of a movement in his direction, particularly in the Chicago area where Judd had to make "desperate exertions" in order to hold the Democratic element in line in the spring municipal election. On the other hand, Lincoln did "not find republicans from the old democratic ranks more inclined to Douglas than those from the old whig ranks," in fact, he believed that the opposite was true.[76]

Although there was some tendency for voters of both elements to go over to Douglas, the leaders remained steadfast. James W. Sheahan, editor of the Chicago organ of Douglas, did not believe that a single Republican leader would desert to Douglas, but expected "large accessions from the rank and file" to do so.[77] Certainly leaders from the Democratic element were not likely to relinquish their newly won prestige and power in the Republican Party to become subordinates of Douglas. They had a vested interest in their party, and it was to their advantage not only to remain in it but to prevent the defection of any large number of the Democratic element. Consequently, they refused to believe that Douglas was honest in his conviction that the people should be permitted to settle the slavery question and accused him of opportunism. They asserted that he had taken warning from the defeat of the Democratic state ticket in 1856, and that he was trimming his sails to suit the antislavery wind, which was blowing over the state, in order that he might be re-elected to the Senate in 1858 and to the presidency in 1860.[78]

However, there was some uncertainty as to the best course to adopt in regard to Douglas. Would he simply lead a secession movement or

---

[75] Judd to Trumbull, Dec. 1, 1857, Trumbull Col. He wrote, "Douglas left here leaving quite a smoke in his rear—having taken a great deal of pains to get into his room several of our good Republicans and talking to them about the desperate effort he intended to make to get Kansas in as a free State, and he really made some of their eyes stick out at his zeal—or in other words it was an attempt to disorganize us by drawing off some of the old democracy."

[76] Lincoln to S. A. Hurlbut, Springfield, June 1, 1858 (photostatic copy in Ill. State Hist. Lib. of original owned by Brown University, Providence, R.I.).

[77] Sheahan to Douglas, May 30, 1858, Douglas Col.

[78] Chicago *Democratic Press* [weekly], Dec. 19, 1857; letters to Trumbull from former Democrats: Judd, Chicago, Nov. 21, 1857; Bissell, Springfield, Dec. 12, 1857; D. L. Phillips, Chicago, Jan. 2, 1858; and from former Whigs: Wm. Pickering, Edwards Co., Ill., Jan. 11, 1858; Charles S. Wilson, Chicago, Nov. 26, Dec. 14, 1857, in Trumbull Col. Koerner gave a like interpretation of his motives in the St. Louis *Anzeiger des westens, Illinois Staats-Zeitung,* and other papers. See Koerner, *Memoirs,* II: 54-56; *Daily Democratic Press,* Jan. 13, 1858.

would he seek to join the Republicans? Trumbull advised a neutral course until they saw how far in their direction his opposition to the administration would carry Douglas. He did not believe that Douglas would join the Republicans unless he was forced to do so by delay in the settlement of the Kansas question. The *Democratic Press* agreed with him.[79] At the same time he advised the party organs to take steps to counteract the sympathy which Douglas was eliciting from many Republicans by his plea that the popular sovereignty principle be fully and fairly executed in Kansas. This could be done, he thought, by showing that Douglas and the Republicans had always agreed on that point. The latter held that the popular sovereignty principle operated at the time a state constitution was made, and, of course, they desired to see fair play in Kansas fully as much as Douglas. But it should also be made clear, he said, first, that Republicans did not approve the principle of popular sovereignty as applied to the territorial period, and secondly, that Douglas had not accepted the Republican solution for the slavery question, namely federal law prohibiting it in territories. So long as he still denied that Congress had power to prohibit slavery in a territory and still accepted the Dred Scott decision, he was not a Republican.[80] Thus Trumbull hoped to hold his party intact by showing the fundamental differences between its position and that of Douglas. Soon the *Illinois Journal* published a long editorial expounding these views, and Palmer and others also adopted them.[81] Meanwhile, Koerner, Judd, O. L. Davis, and George Trumbull from the Democratic element, and Joseph Gillespie, Grimshaw, and William Thomas from the Whig element, decided to *"keep cool* for the present—and see what might be developed in Congress."[82]

While these leaders were advocating a neutral course, others thought that Douglas might actually join the Republicans. Palmer later confessed that he had such hopes. Trible, another anti-Nebraska Democrat, reported that many near Alton hoped early in the controversy that Douglas "would go heart and soul" with the Republicans.[83]

---

[79] *Daily Democratic Press,* Dec. 25, 1857; Trumbull to Lincoln, Washington, Dec. 25, 1857 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.); ———— to [Trumbull], Greenville, Ill., Dec. 26, 1857, Trumbull Col.

[80] Trumbull to Lincoln, Dec. 25, 1857 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.).

[81] *Ill. Jour.,* Jan. 7, 1858; John Trible to Trumbull, Alton, Jan. 13, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[82] O. M. Hatch to Trumbull, Springfield, Jan. 14, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[83] Letters to Trumbull from Palmer, May 25, 1858, and Trible, Jan. 13, 1858, Trumbull Col.

All agreed, however, that he would have to accept their principles first. Even Palmer declared that the "Mohometan formula 'The Koran or the Scimitar' Republicanism either in form or in fact or death (provided we can inflict it)" must be applied to him.[84] To do otherwise would mean the abandonment of their basic principle of congressional intervention. It would mean that they retracted all that they had said against him since 1854. Consequently, Republican leaders stoutly denied that popular sovereignty was actually an antislavery principle. They refused to admit that natural conditions in Kansas and the trans-Mississippi region were unfavorable to slavery, and that the superior colonizing power of the free states made improbable the formation of any new slave states.

The prospect that Douglas might forsake his views did not give rise to unqualified pleasure, however, for it was questionable whether the party could absorb Douglas as it might some less dynamic personality. There was fear that he would convert the party into a "Douglas" Party, thereby crushing out the Republican movement.[85] Judd also feared that he would demand the senatorship as the price of his concession, and he did not want to see all his hard work in getting the party started "result only in keeping a warm place" for Douglas.[86]

While many, in the excitement of the moment, imagined that Douglas was on the verge of renouncing popular sovereignty, there was never any real possibility that he would do so. A far more serious threat to the party lay in the possibility that the Republicans would be forced to support Douglas for re-election to the Senate. With the validity of the Lecompton Constitution as the issue, Douglas would probably have the advantage. The Republicans could not easily oppose him on this, the burning issue of the moment. As Trumbull well knew, if they attempted to face Douglas as an independent party, they could only fall back on their fundamental issue that popular sovereignty had not kept slavery out of Kansas and would never be a sure means of preventing the spread of slavery. Furthermore, in a three-cornered contest, the proslavery Democrats might win. For these reasons the Republicans would be strongly tempted to join forces with the Douglas

[84] Letters to Trumbull from Palmer, May 25, 1858, and Jesse K. Dubois, March 22, April 8, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[85] Letters to Trumbull from Joshua P. Cooper, Marshall, Ill., Jan. 17, 1858, and M. L. Dunlap, Jan. 28, 1858, Trumbull Col. Whig leaders likewise saw the danger. *Ill. State Jour.*, April 10, 1858, quoting Peoria *Transcript*.

[86] Judd to Trumbull, March 7, 1858, Trumbull Col.

Democrats in order to ensure the victory of the anti-Lecompton cause. In fact, in the spring of 1858, lieutenants of Douglas did suggest such a course. One said that Douglas was willing to retire temporarily from the Senate if he could be assured of the election of an anti-Lecompton delegation from Illinois in the next Congress. Another suggested that the Republicans help elect Douglas to the lower house of Congress. Dr. Ray and Ebenezer Peck played with the latter proposal for a time because it seemed to clear the way for Lincoln to go to the Senate in 1858, and at the same time would save the party from the dilemma of supporting Douglas for the Senate or of opposing him in spite of his antislavery stand.[87]

Meanwhile Greeley was urging the thousands of Illinois readers of the New York *Tribune* not to oppose the re-election of Douglas; and reports came from Washington that certain eastern Republicans were making overtures to Douglas, which had the appearance of a bargain by which the party in Illinois was to be forced to accept him.[88] Most Illinois leaders resented such external interference. Regardless of political antecedents, they agreed that their party was not "for sale."[89] The leaders of the Democratic element were unanimous in support of Lincoln for the Senate.[90] Trumbull and Palmer felt especially indebted to him because of the aid of the Whigs in electing Trumbull to the Senate in 1855. Although Palmer had hoped that Douglas would join the Republicans, he refused to carry out such a bargain. He wrote:

> We feel here that we have fought a Strenous [*sic*] and well maintained battle with Douglas backed by the whole Strength of federal patronage and have now some prospect of overthrowing him

---

[87] E. Peck to Trumbull, Chicago, April 15, 1858, Trumbull Col. Trumbull's reply has not been located. Also see C. H. Ray to E. B. Washburne, Chicago, Thursday [April, 1858], Washburne Col. Douglas probably knew nothing of these offers. The fact that Ray believed that Douglas authorized them and that the Republicans were excited over such improbable concessions, shows under what strain they were acting. Albert J. Beveridge, *Abraham Lincoln, 1809-1858* (Boston, 1928), II: 552 n.

[88] On Dec. 18, 1857, Ray asked Trumbull to tell him about "that 'long and confidential interview between Douglas and the leading Republican Senators.'" Trumbull Col. Ten days later, Lincoln inquired of Trumbull whether or not the Republicans at Washington had "concluded that the Republican cause, generally, can be best promoted by sacrificing us here in Illinois?" Tracy, *Uncollected Letters,* 84.

[89] *Daily Democratic Press,* May 14, 1858; Th. Canisius to Trumbull, Alton, April 12, 1858, Trumbull Col.; *Ill. State Jour.,* April 19, May 17, 1858; Herndon to Washburn[e], Springfield, April 10, 1858, Washburne Col.

[90] Letters to Trumbull from G. T. Brown, Alton, April 25, 1858, and D. L. Phillips, Anna, Ill., March 2, 1858, Trumbull Col.

> . . . and now by a "Wall Street operation" Lincoln to whom we are under great obligation and all of our men who have borne the heat and burthen of the conflict are to be kicked to one side and we are to throw up our caps for Judge Douglas and he very coolly tells us all the time that we are abolitionists and negro worshippers and that he accepts our votes as a favor to us.[91]

Charles H. Ray likewise protested. He directed Trumbull to tell the Republicans in the House of Representatives that the party in Illinois had not delegated its power to Washington leaders.[92] Judd, who had just finished directing a strenuous and successful Chicago municipal campaign, demonstrating, as he said, that Douglas had not broken down the Republican ranks, was greatly depressed. He feared that his efforts to hold the Democratic element would be in vain, and he told Trumbull:

> Principle honor self respect and every thing that constitutes my manhood forbids my serving under Douglas . . . .
>
> To see the man elevated again who for the past three years had made our State resound with epithets the lowest and lies the most audacious against the Republicans individually and collectively is more than I will submit to, and I can give you [a] list of names throughout the State that concur with me . . . . I am now convinced that Thurlow Weed, Gov Seward, and Horace Greeley visits to Douglas had there [*sic*] meaning, and that there is an attempt to sell us out and chain us to the car of of [*sic*] Douglas . . . .
>
> Give my respects to Frank Blair and tell him that in any arrangements made with Douglass, they can count out of the fight most of his [Blair's] warm admirers and fast friends.—If our friends in Washington will stand firm, we can beat Douglas and all the Republican influence outside of the State.[93]

The feelers of Douglas Democrats and the advice of eastern Republicans alike were spurned by the Illinoisans. They determined to support their own candidates for all offices. This decision was, in part, the result of resentment against outside interference, but more largely was due to the fact that these men who had been fighting Douglas could not easily become friendly to him and were anxious to win a battle against him. Furthermore, Douglas gave no indication that he intended to become a Republican.[94] Indeed, the Democratic state convention,

---

[91] Palmer to Trumbull, Carlinville, May 25, 1858, Trumbull Col.; Trumbull to Palmer, Washington, June 19, 1858, *Jour. Ill. State Hist. Soc.*, April-June, 1923, p. 40.

[92] Ray to Trumbull, March 9, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[93] Judd to Trumbull, March 7, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[94] Herndon to Trumbull, Springfield, April 12, 24, 1858, Trumbull Col.

which met on April 21, was controlled by Douglas men. It was at last clear that the Republicans no longer needed to desire, yet fear, that Douglas would join them.[95] However, they were faced with a new problem, that of preserving the new breach in their opponents' ranks.

With the meeting of the Democratic state convention it became evident that Douglas would carry with him such a large portion of his party that the Republicans would not be able to profit by the schism.[96] Consequently they sought to encourage the Buchanan men to put candidates into the field.[97] By thus "nursing" the Administration Democrats, they hoped to draw away from the anti-Lecompton men enough votes to give the Republicans a plurality of the total vote. In addition, they watched for opportunities to get recruits for themselves from the Douglas men. Therefore, they were at times quite conciliatory toward them.[98]

On June 16 fifteen hundred Republican delegates met in state convention at Springfield. The Democratic element was well represented and was very active. Judd, as chairman of the state committee, called the meeting to order, and Koerner was president.[99] Palmer, who had presided over the Bloomington convention, Thomas J. Turner, and D. K. Green were among the many vice-presidents. There were two or three former Democrats on the smaller committees and five on the large resolutions committee.[100] The reliance and confidence which the

---

[95] Palmer, quoted in Alton *Courier,* May 8, 1858; Chicago *Tribune,* quoted in Alton *Courier,* May 15, 1858.

[96] Brown estimated that three-fourths of the Democracy were Douglas men. See letter to Trumbull, April 25, 1858, Trumbull Col. The election returns showed his estimate to be too large.

[97] Letters to Trumbull from Brown, Alton, April 25, 1858, E. L. Baker, State Journal Office, Springfield, May 1, 1858, and J. Medill, Chicago, April 22, 1858, in Trumbull Col. show this to be the policy first followed by the Alton *Courier,* Chicago *Tribune,* and *Ill. State Jour.* Koerner did likewise, Koerner to Trumbull, Belleville, June 29, 1858, Trumbull Col. Palmer collected signatures of Buchanan Democrats in order to prove that they were more numerous than the Douglas men admitted, J. M. Palmer to Samuel Willard, Carlinville, May 6, 1858 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.), and Palmer to Trumbull, May 25, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[98] G. T. Brown apparently pursued both policies simultaneously, for he is reported to have been in conference with leaders of the Buchanan Democrats while at the same time he had an understanding with Lincoln and Mark W. Delahay that some Republican speakers should support Douglas until the Buchanan men nominated a separate state ticket and then they should come out firmly for Lincoln. Delahay to Trumbull, Alton, May 22, 1858, Trumbull Col. Also see E. L. Baker to Trumbull, Springfield, May 1, 1858, Trumbull Col., and *Ill. State Jour.,* May 6, 1858.

[99] The official proceedings were published in the *Ill. State Jour.,* June 17, 1858. A Whig, Richard Yates, was temporary chairman.

[100] The following former Democrats served on committees: Credentials—I. N. Arnold, D. L. Phillips, F. S. Rutherford; Permanent Officers—James M.

party had in this group are best seen, however, in the fact that five of the eleven members of the important state central committee were former Democrats. Judd was again put in command of the canvass, and was aided by George T. Brown, Turner, Green, and David L. Phillips.[101] Only two state offices were to be filled in 1858, and neither of the nominees was from the Democratic element.

The orators were again drawn from both elements. Koerner, B. C. Cook, Isaac N. Arnold, and Thomas J. Turner gave addresses, but the memorable speech of this convention, as at that of 1856, was delivered by Lincoln, now the party's choice for United States Senator. Here he gave his famous "House Divided" speech.

Of the nine congressional candidates, three were of Democratic antecedents—Farnsworth in the second (Chicago) district; Jehu Baker, one of the promising younger men in the party, in the eighth (Alton) district; and David L. Phillips in the ninth district. Thus the former Democrats continued to be an important element in the party.

During the canvass, considerable emphasis was laid on economic issues. Due to the panic of 1857 and the crop failure of 1858, economic questions were uppermost in the minds of the people.[102] Even the opposition to slavery was placed upon economic grounds.[103]

The Alton *Courier* laid greater stress on the political aspect of the slavery issue. It asked: "Shall the Government of this country be administer[e]d by the people, for the people, or by a privileged class, for a privileged class?" Moreover, it defended the Republican opposition to the Dred Scott decision on the ground that the Supreme Court's *obiter dicta* were purely political opinion, and that therefore the people were justified in their opposition. The editor accused the Democrats of yielding to the demands of the "aggressive slavocracy," and declared that they would next agree to reopen the foreign slave trade and pass a federal slave code for the territories.[104]

The Republicans had to find some way of combatting the anti-Lecompton position of Douglas who was campaigning on that issue.

Curtis, George W. Rives; Resolutions—N. B. Judd, D. L. Phillips, B. C. Cook and Thomas Quick.

[101] Brown served in the state at large, T. J. Turner in the first district, D. K. Green in the eighth, and D. L. Phillips in the ninth.

[102] C. H. Ray to Trumbull, Chicago, July 17, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[103] Half of the resolutions in the platform dealt with public lands, internal improvements, a Pacific railroad, and the extravagance of the federal government. *Ill. State Jour.*, June 17, 1858.

[104] Alton *Courier*, Aug. 2, Sept. 24, 1858.

They tried to do this by making him share with them the odium of opposing the Supreme Court. The ground for their attack was carefully prepared. On May 20 the Chicago *Democratic Press* announced that the issues were the authority of Congress to exclude slavery from a territory and, if Congress failed to prohibit it, the right of the people of the territory to do so. At the same time, it told its readers that Douglas, by accepting the Dred Scott decision, had held that a territory had no such right. This was repeated by the Alton *Courier* on July 12. A little later, various papers began to ask Douglas the question, "Do you believe that the people of a Territory, whilst a Territory, and before the formation of a State constitution, have the right to exclude slavery?"[105] The *Illinois State Journal* reminded the people that Trumbull had asked Douglas this question in 1856 and that he had then deferred to the Supreme Court for the answer. Then the *Journal,* echoed by the Alton *Courier,* asked why it was that Douglas continued to "saw the air" in protesting his belief in popular sovereignty after its validity was denied by the Supreme Court.[106] Trumbull also called attention to the different interpretations of popular sovereignty and the time when it became effective in a territory, and declared that Douglas held that the people of a territory could not keep slavery out of the territory.[107]

Finally, on August 27, Lincoln took up the attack in the second of the questions which he asked Douglas during the joint debate at Freeport.[108] As Douglas said, his opponents already knew his answer; but they were trying to put him on the defensive. He explained again that slavery could not exist anywhere without the protection of local legislation. Therefore, if people did not want slavery they could exclude it by refusing to give security to slaveowners by means of police regulations. This was not in direct contravention of the Dred Scott decision that Congress, and by implication the territorial legislature, could not prohibit slavery by law. However, Douglas in summing up his argument did make the statement that the introduction of slavery could be prevented by "unfriendly legislation." This was the sort of opening for which the Republicans were watching, and the Alton *Courier* imme-

[105] Bloomington *Pantagraph,* quoted in *Ill. State Jour.,* July 17, 1858.

[106] July 29, 1858.

[107] *Great Speech of Hon. Lyman Trumbull, on the Issues of the Day* [Springfield, Ill., 1858], 3.

[108] Prior to the debate, C. H. Ray wrote Washburne asking him to tell Lincoln to "charge!" at Freeport. "Do not let him keep on the defensive," he wrote. "Let him . . . commence thus: 'I charge so and so,' and prove it thus. . . . We must not be parrying all the while," n.d., Washburne Col.

diately (August 31) seized upon it. Brown said that the word "unfriendly" meant prohibitory, and declared that Douglas had conceded the right of the people of a territory to exclude slavery by law. He had therefore taken a position "fairly and squarely in vital opposition to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the DRED SCOTT case, by which the Judge had heretofore sworn so firmly."

Thus the Republicans raised the cry that Douglas, like themselves, rejected a decision of the highest court of the nation. They also used his answer to buttress their attempt to convince the voters that Douglas could not be depended upon to hold a steady course. They declared that he first defended and then repealed the Missouri Compromise; first advocated "squatter sovereignty" and then denied it; first endorsed the Dred Scott decision, and then under pressure tried to reconcile it with popular sovereignty by developing a principle which was an "infringement of the United States Constitution."[109]

During the campaign, leaders from the Democratic element were very active. Judd worked hard to organize the campaign, meeting his state committee and the congressional candidates, and sending out questionnaires to get information. He instructed workers to get Lincoln voters out early, and to challenge every doubtful person.[110]

The seven Lincoln-Douglas debates attracted wide notice, but great audiences also heard Trumbull, Palmer, and Koerner, as well as Francis P. Blair, Jr., of Missouri, and Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio. The Republicans were none too sanguine, and realized fully the magnetism and popularity of their opponent. Consequently, they drafted the best of their stump speakers and organizers. Trumbull was in great demand for his ability to organize, and also to make convincing speeches. By mid-July the Republicans were "looking anxiously" for his return from Washington, and Ray urged him to hasten home, saying:

> We must press you into the work on hand, and that pretty soon. The pot begins to boil and you must help keep up the fire. We have been looking for you before now, and shall continue to look and hope until you come. I think you can do great good in Madison, St. Clair and Randolph where we want aid badly; and of course your labors would be thankfully accepted elsewhere.[111]

---

[109] Chicago *Press and Tribune,* Oct. 23, 1858.

[110] Judd to Washburne, Chicago, Aug. 17, 1858, and circular letters, Sept. 25, Oct. 22, 1858, Washburne Col.

[111] Letters to Trumbull from N. B. Judd, July 16, and Ray, July 17, 1858, Trumbull Col.

But the Whig element appreciated Trumbull as fully as his fellow Democrats. Jesse K. Dubois was very insistent that he begin work at once. "My observation is," he wrote Trumbull, "that we old line whigs belon[g]ing to the Republican ranks are not worth a curse to carry on a campaign and its only life is in the Democratic part of the ranks."[112]

Trumbull opened his campaign on August 7 at Chicago. He charged the Administration with using its money, power, and patronage to encourage the spread of slavery and the domination of the slave power. Then he described the alleged aggressions of the slaveholders, closing with the favorite Republican prophecy that the South would claim next that the Constitution carried slavery into the free states. "I acknowledge," he declaimed, "a power higher than presidents, higher than Congresses, higher than supreme courts, and to that power, whose name is the people, I will appeal." The speech was published in Republican papers, and in pamphlet form was scattered broadcast over the state.[113] Trumbull made many other speeches and put forth valiant efforts in the party's cause. In the thick of the contest also were Koerner, Hecker, Schneider, and other Germans who wielded their greatest influence in the German centers.[114] Palmer, Isaac N. Arnold, and F. S. Rutherford also pressed the fight with great vigor and enthusiasm.

The Republicans elected their state ticket and four members of Congress but failed to get control of the legislature and hence of the seat in the Senate. Nevertheless, they were not discouraged. They praised the Germans lavishly for their efforts in Chicago, Quincy, and Freeport, and in St. Clair and Peoria counties. The Chicago *Press and Tribune* declared that the "ground work of future triumphs" had been laid in a "compact, reliable, earnest and united party," if not in a well-organized one. On the whole, the party looked forward with confidence to 1860. With such men as Trumbull and Judd and their aptness for political organization, with the enthusiasm and aggressiveness of Ray and Brown, and with the eloquence of Koerner and Palmer, there was being infused into the party a "spirit and energy which Whig traditions could never inspire."[115]

---

[112] July 17, 1858, Trumbull Col.

[113] *Great Speech of Hon. Lyman Trumbull,* 7; J. Medill, Ray, Scripps, to ———, Press and Tribune Office, Chicago, Aug. 24, 1858, Washburne Col.

[114] Heinrich A. Rattermann, *Gustav Körner, Deutsch-amerikanischer Jurist, Staatsmann, Diplomat und Geschichtschreiber* (Cincinnati, 1902), 299.

[115] *Press and Tribune,* Nov. 6, 9, 1858; James G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress* (Norwich, Conn., 1884), I: 117.

Republican interest in slavery agitation persisted during the next two years. Indeed, that agitation was a basic factor in the party's origin and continuance. They sought to discomfit Douglas and prevent his reconciliation with the Buchanan Democrats, which in turn might defeat Douglas' presidential aspirations by forcing him to take sides on questions involving the slavery issue. If he leaned too far in the direction of the South, they expected his popularity in the Northwest to suffer; if he looked too much to the North, he would probably lose support in the South.[116]

Illinois Republicans had also to deal with a problem in party harmony. The component elements of the party had not yet amalgamated. They were Republicans only so far as the slavery extension issue was concerned. On other questions they retained their former views whether they were Whigs, Free Soilers, or Democrats. This feeling of separatism and jealousy was never entirely absent. Candidates were consciously chosen from each element, and platforms studiously avoided questions outside the realm of Republicanism. Sangamon County Whigs objected to George R. Weber as a candidate for the legislature in 1860 because he had published a Democratic newspaper and had made "hard charges" against Henry Clay. "There is a disturbing element in the Rep. party in this State which I fear will produce mischief," John Olney told Trumbull. "It is that we have not forgotten our former party prejudices. And whigs and democrats retain altogether too much hostility against each other to be good Republicans."[117]

For the most part, the Democratic wing supported Judd as candidate for governor in 1860. He had been state senator for sixteen years, and was one of the five anti-Nebraska Democrats who had been instrumental in securing Trumbull's election to the Senate in 1855. Moreover, in the recent legislative session, he had displayed outstanding ability in his fight against the Democratic legislative apportionment bill. He was a member of the Republican national committee, and as chairman of the state committee he had been largely responsible for the party's success in two state elections. Furthermore, he was from Chicago, a

[116] J. P. Cooper suggested that they get some southern fire-eater to introduce into Congress a bill establishing a territorial slave code. Nov. 25, 1858, Trumbull Col. See Horace White to Trumbull, Chicago, Dec. 8, 1858, Washburne Col., for plan to introduce a bill abolishing slavery in the Kansas territorial legislature. Such a bill was passed but vetoed. See the Republican national platform of 1860.

[117] Letters to Trumbull from John B. Weber, Sangamon County, Ill., Jan. 29, 1861; John Olney, Shawneetown, March 12, 1860; J. F. Alexander, Sept. 21, 1857; and Samuel Hoard, March 14, 1858, Trumbull Col.

strong Republican center, which had as yet received no recognition.[118] Because he had been a Democrat, he was particularly desirable as a candidate in the eyes of the Democratic element.

In general, the Whig element preferred a Whig for the candidate. Both Senator Trumbull and Governor Bissell were former Democrats, and since it was presumed that Trumbull would be re-elected, many Whigs insisted that they should name the gubernatorial candidate. They thought it unfair to them that both national and state patronage should be controlled by the Democratic element. So deep-seated was this prejudice that Trumbull's friends feared that Judd's nomination might lead to Trumbull's defeat.[119] Although it was admitted by most that no man in the state had "done more to advance the Republican cause than Mr. Judd," one of his friends believed that it was necessary to yield somewhat to the "whiggery and democracy" in the party in order to ensure success in 1860.[120]

Although Judd's aspirations were favored by many members of the Democratic wing, they were vigorously opposed by John Wentworth. "Long John" and his paper, the Chicago *Democrat,* had a powerful influence in state politics, and it was partly due to his opposition that Judd was not nominated. In 1858 Judd complained that Wentworth was trying to divide the party into Trumbull and Lincoln factions by alleging that the anti-Nebraska Democrats had cheated Lincoln out of a seat in the Senate and then had "farmed out" all the offices so that they could control the party for years to come.[121] Trumbull agreed with Judd, describing Wentworth's endeavor as a "despicably mean thing and just such an act as it would take a man of Wentworth['s] reputed character to be guilty of," and assured Lincoln that Judd, Cook, Palmer, and himself had worked for Lincoln in 1858 with "entire good faith." Lincoln declared that any effort to stir up bad feeling between

[118] *Press and Tribune,* March 16, 1860; letters to Trumbull from George T. Brown, Nov. 25, 1859, and D. L. Phillips, March 6, 1860, Trumbull Col.; and H. Kreismann to Washburne, Chicago, May 13, 1860, Washburne Col.

[119] Letters to Trumbull from Olney, March 12, 1860, and Wm. Jayne, May 13, 1860, Trumbull Col.

[120] Olney to Trumbull, March 12, 1860, Trumbull Col. D. G. Hay of Burnt Prairie, Ill., reported that the Fillmore men in his county were determined to have a large preponderance of Whigs on the state ticket, April 2, 1860, Trumbull Col.

[121] Lincoln wrote Henry C. Whitney on Dec. 18, 1857, that the party could "not afford to lose the services of 'Long John'" and that he was sorry to see the "unrelenting warfare" made upon him by the Republican papers of Chicago (photostatic copy, Ill. State Hist. Lib.). The two men had long been rivals, Arthur C. Cole, *The Era of the Civil War, 1848-1870 (Centennial History of Ill.,* III, Springfield, 1919), 190. Judd to [Trumbull], Chicago, Dec. 26, 1858, Trumbull Col.

himself and the men from the old Democratic ranks was "as idle as the wind."[122]

The rivalry was intensified in 1860 when both men desired political office. Judd, Ray, Kreismann, I. N. Arnold, and Schneider tried in vain to prevent Wentworth from becoming the Republican candidate for mayor of Chicago.[123] Their opposition seemed only to confirm Wentworth in his determination to prevent Judd's nomination for governor. His hostility was detrimental to Judd because many thought that he could not be elected if Wentworth carried out his threat to oppose him even though he should be nominated.[124]

At the Decatur state convention on May 9, 1860, the Democratic element did not furnish the permanent president as formerly, but it did continue to play a relatively large part in the work of organization. Palmer served as temporary chairman, and J. H. Bryant as one of nine vice-presidents. T. J. Turner and William B. Plato and possibly one or two other former Democrats helped to nominate the permanent officers.[125] Turner was chairman of the committee. The party's confidence in the organizing ability of the former Democrats was again demonstrated by the composition of the state central committee. Five of the fourteen members of that very important committee were from the Democratic element. Judd was retained as chairman, and with Peck and Koerner constituted three-fifths of the members-at-large. Cornelius Lansing, a Cass elector in 1848, was put in command of the campaign in the first district, and Charles B. Lawrence was committeeman for the fourth district.[126]

In choosing presidential electors, the party likewise acknowledged the ability of the former Democrats not only to organize a campaign

---

[122] Trumbull to Lincoln, Washington, Jan. 28, 1859, and Lincoln to Trumbull, Springfield, Feb. 3, 1859; William H. Lambert, "A Lincoln Correspondence: Twenty-two Letters of Historical Interest Here Published for the First Time," *Century Magazine*, Vol. 77, no. 4 (Feb., 1909), 621.

[123] Letters to Washburne from C. H. Ray, [Feb.], 18[60], and Kreismann, Feb. 9, 1860, Washburne Col.; Chicago *Times*, Feb. 8, 10, 1860; Chicago *Daily Journal*, Feb. 18, 1860; Chicago *Democrat* [weekly], March 10, 1860.

[124] Chicago *Times*, Feb. 8, 1860.

[125] Only two of the committee of nine have not been identified. Since they represented the eighth and ninth districts in the southern part of the state they may once have been Democrats. They were F. A. Carpenter and D. T. Linegar. Chicago *Democrat* [weekly], May 19, 1860.

[126] *Ill. State Jour.* [weekly], June 6, 1860. On the state committee there were five former Whigs and four whose political antecedents are unknown. For the committee members see Chicago *Press and Tribune*, May 28, 1860. Moses, *Illinois, Historical and Statistical*, II: 1,204.

but also to attract voters from their opponents. In 1856 they had taken four of the eleven electors from that wing of the party; four years later they selected five. Moreover, nearly half of the delegates to the national convention were former Democrats, men who had proved their value as workers in the new party.[127] Obviously, the Whigs were relying greatly on the talents of their Democratic co-workers.

On the other hand, platform making, as before, devolved largely upon the Whigs. Only one member of the resolutions committee, so far as has been learned, was a former Democrat.[128] Furthermore, the Whig element dominated the state ticket; only one of the six nominees came from the Democratic element. Francis A. Hoffman was candidate for lieutenant governor. In addition, the Whigs furnished most of the congressional candidates. Only Isaac N. Arnold was from the Democratic element.[129] Thus the Whigs apparently felt that it was their turn to have the offices, but were still depending upon their Democratic friends for leadership in the task of organizing the party.

The election of 1860 was an important one for Illinois, for it was one of the three key states. In order to win, the Republicans needed Pennsylvania and either Illinois or Indiana. But more was at stake than the presidency, for the legislature would elect a United States senator to succeed Trumbull. Furthermore, to win the legislature meant that they could guarantee their dominance for years by redistricting the state.[130] The flood of immigration into the northern counties during the Fifties had resulted in the over-representation of the strongly Democratic southern counties, and the under-representation of the northern counties where the Republicans were strongest. To win the legislature

---

[127] Four electors were former Whigs; two remain unidentified—J. Stark and John Olney. Palmer was elector-at-large; Allen C. Fuller, William B. Plato, Lawrence Weldon, and T. G. Allen were electors in the three northern and the eighth districts. Editors Schneider and Sloo, state representatives B. C. Cook and O. L. Davis, party workers D. L. Phillips, F. S. Rutherford, D. K. Green, Koerner, and Judd were delegates to the national convention. There were also nine Whigs and four whose political antecedents have not been learned.

[128] Pease and Randall, eds., *Diary of Orville Hickman Browning,* I: 405-406. T. C. Moore of Kane County had been a Democrat; five had been Whigs; three are as yet unidentified. Chicago *Daily Journal,* May 11, 1860, published the names of the committee.

[129] Five former Whigs and a Liberty Party man were selected; two others have not been identified.

[130] S. P. Chase to Trumbull, Columbus, Nov. 12, 1860, Trumbull Col.; Preston King to E. B. Washburne, Washington, Aug. 3, 1860, Washburne Col.; *Ill. State Jour.* [weekly], Nov. 7, 1860; Lincoln to Dr. Wm. Fithian, Springfield, Aug. 15, 1860 (MS, Ill. State Hist. Lib.). Lincoln said, "To lose Trumbull's re-election next winter would be a great disaster."

would be a real struggle; it seemed to the Republicans just as important as winning the presidency.

In deciding upon a presidential candidate the Democratic element did not show partisan prejudice as they had in the case of Judd. Their choice lay not between former Democrats—Simon Cameron of Pennsylvania or Salmon P. Chase of Ohio—but among former Whigs—William H. Seward of New York, John McLean of Ohio, or Lincoln. They were interested primarily in victory, so those who rejected Seward for his supposed radicalism rejected Chase for the same reason. For a time Edward Bates, conservative Whig of Missouri, was popular, but the movement met a serious obstacle in the opposition of the Germans and the Chicago *Press and Tribune,* three of whose editors were former Democrats.[131]

Although Seward had a large following, his greatest strength was in the northern counties. His popularity would give little or no aid in carrying the doubtful legislative districts. Koerner and Lincoln agreed that he might get as large a vote in the whole state as some others, but they doubted that he could get it *"at the right places."*[132] Moreover, he was constantly called radical by the *Press and Tribune,* which had early announced its preference for Lincoln. This was the popular conception and did much to blight Seward's prospects.[133] Under no circumstances could the party hope to win the conservative Whigs of central and southern Illinois with a radical candidate. Furthermore, Seward's opposition to the Know Nothings while he was governor of New York was also an obstacle to his success, although it commended him to the German voters.[134] For some of or all these reasons, leading Republicans insisted that Seward could not carry Illinois.

Justice John McLean was also a favorite with many. As favorable reports came from Illinois and Indiana, Trumbull became convinced that he would be the best compromise candidate.[135]

---

[131] F. I. Herriott, "The Conference in the Deutsches Haus, Chicago, May 14-15, 1860," *Trans. Ill. State Hist. Soc., 1928,* 135-44; Koerner to Trumbull, Belleville, Dec. 23, 1859, Trumbull Col.; Chicago *Press and Tribune,* March 15, 1860.

[132] Letters to Trumbull from Koerner, Belleville, April 16, 1860, and H. S. Thomas, Vermont, Ill., April 2, 1860, Trumbull Col.; Lincoln to Trumbull, Springfield, May 1, 1860, Tracy, *Uncollected Letters,* 144.

[133] *Press and Tribune,* Feb. 27, 1860; F. P. Blair to M. Van Buren, Silver Spring, Md., Van Buren Col. (MSS, Lib. Cong.).

[134] Chicago *Democrat* [weekly], May 19, 1860; Alexander K. McClure, *Recollections of Half a Century* (Salem, Mass., 1902), 216-19.

[135] Trumbull to Lincoln, Washington, April 24, 1860, Trumbull Col.; Lincoln to Trumbull, Springfield, April 29, 1860, Tracy, *Uncollected Letters,* 142-43; Trumbull to McLean, Washington, April 21, 1860, McLean Col. (MSS, Lib. Cong.).

Lincoln also had many friends. Former Democrats Ray, Scripps, and Bross (editors of the *Press and Tribune),* and Judd, Peck, Kreismann, and Trumbull all urged his claims. But few of them expected him to be nominated.[136] Nevertheless they took steps to make his nomination as a compromise candidate possible. Judd believed rightly that the Illinois delegation would be instructed for Lincoln. In the case of the other doubtful states, he suggested that there be no open fight for delegates "distinctly Lincoln" but that quiet efforts should be made to obtain the selection of men who made Lincoln their second choice.[137] This was a shrewd move, for the nomination was almost certain to go to the man most likely to carry the doubtful states. It was pointed out that Lincoln's Whig antecedents and his favorable attitude on the protective tariff would recommend him to Pennsylvania. Moreover, his friends insisted that he alone could defeat Douglas in Illinois should the "Little Giant" be the Democratic candidate. In addition, as a westerner, his drawing power in Indiana would exceed that of an eastern man.[138]

Finally, Lincoln's friends sought to create for him a reputation of being a moderate antislavery man—one who occupied a "happy mean" between the radicalism of Seward and the conservatism of Bates. Certainly his statement that a house divided against itself cannot long endure, was not less radical than Seward's reference to the irrepressible conflict. In fact, when Trumbull urged Lincoln's claims in Washington, he nearly always met with the reply, "If you are going to nominate a man of that stamp why not take Seward?" "There seems to be," Trumbull wrote Lincoln, "a disposition in the public-mind to associate you together, from the fact, I suppose, that you have both given expression

---

[136] *Press and Tribune,* Feb. 16, 1860; Trumbull to Lincoln, Washington, April 24, 1860, "A Lincoln Correspondence," *Century Magazine,* Feb., 1909, p. 623; Kreismann to Washburne, Chicago, May 1, 1860, Washburne Col.; David Davis to Henry E. Dummer, Bloomington, Ill., Feb. 20, 1860 (MS, Chicago Hist. Soc.); W. Jayne to Trumbull, Springfield, May 20, 1860, Trumbull Col.; W. H. Bissell to S. P. Chase, Springfield, Feb. 4, 1860, Chase Col. (Lib. Cong.).

[137] N. B. Judd to [Trumbull], Chicago, April 2, 1860, Trumbull Col.

[138] J. R. Giddings wrote to G. W. Julian, May 25, 1860, that "Lincoln was selected on account of his *location,* not because of objection to Seward or Chase, but because being a western man, located in Illinois, he was supposed able to carry that State and Indiana and was acceptable to Pennsylvania." He added, "It is also true that some of the Doughfaces seemed to think him more popular because his anti-slavery sentiments had been less prominent," but he, himself, trusted Lincoln on the subject of slavery as much as he did Chase or Seward. Grace Julian Clarke, *George W. Julian (Indiana Historical Collections,* XI, Indianapolis, 1923), 206.

to a similar sentiment in regard to the ultimate extinction of slavery." While this impression made Lincoln acceptable to the Free Soil element in the party, it made the conservatives suspicious of him. Therefore, his friends emphasized his so-called native conservatism, and pointed in proof of it to the Cooper Institute speech. The *Press and Tribune* was especially active in this effort.[139]

It was largely due to Judd's efforts that the national convention met at Chicago. Much importance was attached to this by Lincoln's friends who felt that they had gained an advantage by bringing the convention to Lincoln's home state.[140] Men in large groups, laboring under the excitement of such an occasion, are not always compelled by either logic or reason. They are often swayed by impressions of which they are scarcely conscious. "Believe me," wrote one delegate, "in such things as these it is not the activity of friends who determine the result. It is the mere exigency of the moment—the current or drift of popular sentiment which cannot be controlled by friends."[141] In Chicago, delegates were immersed in a distinctly Lincoln atmosphere. His picture was everywhere and banners and cheers added to the impression that the city was enthusiastically supporting Lincoln.[142] Thousands of his friends swarmed in the streets. Such a scene did much to convert the undecided to Lincoln. Many an uninstructed delegate had come to Chicago determined to test the current before announcing his preference in order that he might say later that he had always supported the party's nominee. Consequently the selection of Chicago as the meeting place of the convention was a significant factor in the selection of the candidate, and the credit for this achievement apparently belongs to Judd, a former Democrat.

The Democratic element was represented by nine of the twenty-two delegates from Illinois, a proportion much greater than its voting strength certainly. Moreover, two of the six posts in the convention, to be filled by the delegation, were given to former Democrats: O. L. Davis, who was a secretary, and Koerner, who was on the resolutions committee. A minority group could not expect more.

---

[139] Feb. 16, May 15, 1860.

[140] Koerner, *Memoirs,* II: 80. Lincoln did not place so much value on it. Lincoln to Judd, Springfield, Dec. 14, 1859, Nicolay and Hay, eds., *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln,* V: 282.

[141] Edward L. Pierce to Salmon P. Chase, Chicago, May 13, 1860, quoted in *Trans. Ill. State Hist. Soc., 1928,* pp. 127-28.

[142] Indianapolis *Journal* [daily], May 16, 1860.

The resolutions committee appointed a sub-committee of seven—three former Democrats, three former Whigs, and Carl Schurz who was an original Republican. The influence of the three Democrats—Koerner, George Boutwell of Massachusetts, and Jacob Brinkerhoff of Ohio—can be traced in two resolutions. Due to the insistence of Koerner and Schurz an anti-nativist plank was adopted. Furthermore, although they failed to prevent the inclusion of a tariff plank, they did force a compromise which was capable of interpretation according to the views of the reader. Koerner, of old a free trade Democrat, accepted it as one which "amounted to no more than the establishment of a revenue tariff bill with incidental protection," which did not "differ essentially from former Democratic declarations on the same subject."[143] On the other hand, others thought it a statement of the Whig doctrine.

Of course the chief matter of interest during those three days in mid-May was the presidential nomination. Friends of each candidate were feverishly engaged in talking to the delegates. Republicans who had been Whigs were active in Lincoln's behalf, but men from the Democratic element also worked unceasingly. Dr. John Evans found old acquaintances among the Indiana delegates whom he had known when he was active in Indiana politics before his removal to Chicago, and he appealed to them to vote for Lincoln. Palmer believed that Judd and David Davis (former Whig) contributed most to Lincoln's nomination.[144]

Koerner and Browning (former Whig) attended a joint meeting of the Pennsylvania and Indiana delegates. They arrived in time to refute the speech by Frank Blair in behalf of Bates. Koerner declared that Bates could not even carry Missouri, and that thousands of Germans would not support him because he had voted the Know Nothing ticket. Browning added that Lincoln had always opposed nativism, and assured the delegates that foreign voters would support Lincoln. He also appealed to the partisan prejudices of the former Whigs by reminding them that Lincoln had been a Whig. Later the Indiana delegates decided to vote as a unit on the first ballot for Lincoln,[145] and not long

[143] Koerner, *Memoirs,* II: 85-90; Rattermann, *Gustav Körner* (Cincinnati, 1902), 300; *The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz* (New York, 1907), II: 180; Lincoln to Edward Wallace, Oct. 11, 1859, and May 12, 1860, Nicolay and Hay, eds., *Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln,* V: 256, VI: 11.

[144] *Ind. Mag. Hist.,* Sept., 1923, p. 238; Palmer, *Personal Recollections,* 81.

[145] Koerner, *Memoirs,* II: 87-89; John S. Bobbs to Simon Cameron, Indianapolis, May 19, 1860, Simon Cameron Collection (MSS, Lib. Cong.); Indianapolis *Journal* [daily], May 17, 1860.

afterward the Pennsylvanians made him their second choice. Possibly this was due to pledges given by David Davis that Cameron would receive a cabinet post, but certainly they could not have been entirely insensible to the general trend of feeling toward Lincoln and to the eloquence of the Illinoisans.

The New Jersey delegates also received the attentions of Lincoln's friends. Judge Davis learned that they favored a Seward-Lincoln ticket. Of course the Lincoln men desired to stop any such attempt to shelve him, so Davis asked Palmer to talk to them. He used Browning's approach of the earlier meeting when he told this delegation that "there were forty thousand Democrats who would vote the Republican ticket, but who would not consent to do so if two old Whigs were placed upon the ticket." The skeptical delegates asked Davis if this were true, and Davis clinched the argument with the exclamation, "Oh! Oh! these old Loco-focos will do anything!" Palmer insisted that there must be one former Democrat on the ticket. Thus the incipient movement to make Lincoln the vice-presidential candidate was stopped. Davis, with Palmer's aid, had won his point, and Palmer rejoiced that two "old Whig party men" were not put on the ticket.[146]

Judd presented Lincoln's name to the convention, and on the third ballot he was nominated. Hannibal Hamlin, an anti-Nebraska Democrat in 1854, became the candidate for vice-president. Again the Democratic element shared in the award of party honors. In the judgment of James G. Blaine, the Whig element made no mistake in thus rewarding this small but powerful minority. He believed that Hamlin "proved a source of strength, and imparted confidence and courage to the great movement against the Democratic party."[147]

Illinois endorsed Judd's previous successes by reappointing him to the national committee. As state chairman and member of the national committee Judd was commander in chief of one of the most colorful campaigns in American history. He proved to be "ever vigilant, quick, far-seeing and equal to every emergency."[148] Under his leadership a system, by which every voter was to be registered, was worked out. A mailing list was prepared from tax lists and sent to Washington to be used in the distribution of campaign literature. They organized as

---

[146] Palmer, *Recollections*, 81.

[147] James G. Blaine, *Twenty Years of Congress* (Norwich, Conn., 1884), I: 170.

[148] *Ill. State Jour.* [weekly], May 16, Nov. 14, 1860.

they had never organized before.[149]

Former Democrats were ever in demand as speakers—Trumbull, Koerner, Palmer, Kreismann, Hoffman, Hecker, and others. Koerner believed that "the heaviest and most important work was done by those who had belonged to the Democratic party."[150] They pursued their opponents with such energy and vigor that the Democrats felt that they had their "hands full."[151] Men of Democratic antecedents were brought in from other states. From Wisconsin and Missouri came Senator J. R. Doolittle and Frank Blair; Ohio contributed Chase and David K. Cartter; John P. Hale came from New Hampshire.

The editors of the Chicago *Press and Tribune*—Ray, Bross, Scripps, and Medill, all except the last being former Democrats—threw themselves wholeheartedly into the fray. The *Illinois Staats-Zeitung* was a zealous supporter of Lincoln.[152] Wentworth and his *Chicago Democrat* also worked hard, and in the end claimed the credit for victory. Wentworth, however, refused to preach the middle-of-the-road policy adopted by the majority but boldly proclaimed his own interpretation of Republicanism. He insisted that a Democratic victory would mean either the extension of slavery to every corner of the land or an uprising in the North which would destroy the "slave power." He constantly referred to Lincoln's statement that the Union could not permanently endure half slave and half free. He talked of the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law and the passing of a new one giving slaveowners only those rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Such radical talk was deprecated and avoided by most Republicans but Wentworth persisted.[153]

Victory crowned these efforts in behalf of Lincoln and the presidency was won. In Illinois his popular vote was greater than the total

---

[149] Letters to Trumbull from W. C. Flagg, Madison County, Ill., April 1, 1860; Koerner, Belleville, March 15, April 16, 1860; Preston King, Washington, Aug. 30, 1860; Geo. Harrington, Sept. 27, 1860; and W. H. Herndon, Springfield, June 19, 1860—in the Trumbull Col.; Preston King to Gideon Welles, Washington, July 30, 1860, Gideon Welles Col. (MSS, Lib. Cong.).

[150] Koerner, *Memoirs,* II: 83-84. C. H. Ray told Washburne that Kreismann was the most efficient worker the party had among the Germans, [Feb.], 18[60], Washburne Col. Judd also had a high opinion of him. See Kreismann to Washburne, Chicago, Sept. 3, 1860, Washburne Col.

[151] Anthony Thornton to N. Hickox, Shelbyville, Ill., Aug. 21, 1860, Charles H. Lanphier Col. This collection was used with the permission of the owners, Dr. Charles L. Patton and William L. Patton of Springfield, Ill.

[152] Koerner, *Memoirs*, II: 83-84; *Ill. State Jour.* [weekly], Nov. 14, 1860.

[153] Chicago *Democrat* [weekly], June 30, Nov. 3, 10, 17, 1860; W. H. Stickney to Trumbull, Chicago, Sept. 13, 1860, Trumbull Col.

received by his opponents. Thus the Democrats were not defeated because they divided their votes between Douglas and Breckinridge, but rather because thousands of men usually voting the Democratic ticket supported Lincoln. Although the Democrats doubled their votes in Illinois from 1852 to 1860, the combined vote of Douglas and Breckinridge in 1860 represented a smaller percentage of the total vote than Pierce had received in 1852. Obviously, they had lost ground. Had they received their normal share of the increase in votes, they could have won easily. It is even possible that Douglas—in spite of the split in the party—could have carried Illinois had not several thousands of those usually voting the Democratic ticket cast their ballots for Lincoln. As it was, a sufficient number deserted to Lincoln to give him the victory. The chief centers of the Democratic insurgency were in nine counties, most of them in the north.[154]

As usual, the Republicans carried the four northern congressional districts, including the one in which Isaac N. Arnold was the candidate. All the state offices and the legislature also fell to them, thus ensuring the re-election of Trumbull to the United States Senate.

The anti-Nebraska Democrats had made a valuable contribution to the organization and success of the fusion movement. Their abilities and energies had been employed and appreciated by their Whig co-workers. However, there were some who felt that a minority should not have such a prominent place in the party. On the other hand, the Democratic element resented any attempt at complete Whig domination of the party. Lincoln, as President-elect, had to deal with this feeling, and it required all of his political acumen and understanding of human nature to keep peace and harmony among the factions in the Republican Party.

---

[154] These statements are based upon a comparison of the returns of 1852 and 1860. The method of computation previously used in this study was followed. The estimated Democratic vote of 1860, i. e., the number they should have had if they had received their normal share of the increase in voters, was apportioned between Douglas and Breckinridge in the same ratio as the actual vote was divided between them. The result showed that Lincoln's vote without the support of the Democratic insurgents was less than that of Douglas. The nine counties were Cook, Henry, Lee, La Salle, Grundy, Iroquois, DeWitt, Madison, and St. Clair.

A NEW ENGLAND FAMILY ON THE ILLINOIS FRONTIER

By ALICE FELT TYLER*

Among the many families that came up from Massachusetts to settle in southern New Hampshire in the late eighteenth century was that of John Stearns. Of good Puritan stock the Stearns family had already been more than a hundred years in the New World, and had numbered among its members the usual New England assortment of sea captains, farmers, and clergymen. Only occasionally had any member of the family amassed any great amount of property, but there had rarely been real poverty among them, and always they had reared their children in piety, and had provided for them the best education available.

John Stearns and his wife Chloe had eight daughters and two sons, and it is from a little package of papers found in the attic of the great-grandson of the youngest daughter, Elizabeth,[1] that the material has been gleaned for this brief account of the years that she lived in Illinois. Earlier schoolgirl diaries tell of her New England girlhood, and are filled with the details of busy country life in a day when baking, spinning, weaving, and sewing left little time for idleness for even the youngest member of a large family. They tell, also, of an active social life, of numerous cultural interests, and of constant and conscious efforts at self-improvement.

In near-by Peterborough, New Hampshire, lived a large clan, named Smith, a prosperous family of Scotch-Irish descent. Two of Elizabeth's elder sisters married into that family, and there was a constant interchange of visits. One of the sons of Deacon John Smith of Peterborough was a young man, William by name, who seems to have had the wanderlust from boyhood, for only occasionally was he home from "the West" when young Elizabeth visited in his family. Her

* Assistant Professor of History, University of Minnesota.

[1] Elizabeth Stearns, who became Mrs. William Smith, was the grandmother of the writer's husband. The papers upon which this article is based are now in the possession of the writer.

schoolgirl diaries mention the interest with which she listened to his tales of New Orleans, of the Mississippi River, and of the trans-Mississippi West, but the diaries come to an end in 1831 with no evidence of any deeper or more personal interest.

For the years between 1831 and 1838 there is no material—not a scrap of paper remains to indicate how those years were spent. At some time during that period, however, William Smith must have remained at home long enough to have wooed and won Elizabeth. Perhaps the necessity for providing her with a home caused him to decide to settle on the banks of the Mississippi in the Illinois Country, perhaps he already had interests there. At any rate William and Elizabeth were married in 1838, and it was to Illinois that they went to live. The following account of their life there has been taken from their letters to the family in New Hampshire, letters preserved through the years by Elizabeth's sister, Susan, who had married William's brother.

It was sometime during the Thirties, therefore, that the roving William Smith decided to settle in Hancock County, Illinois. The Mississippi formed its western boundary, and across the sullen waters lay the new territory of Iowa. Family tradition has it that William Smith was one of the founders of the village of La Harpe, and that he gave it the name of the Swiss philosopher and tutor of Tsar Alexander I. In any case the village was new and very small when he went East in 1838 to marry Elizabeth Stearns—spinster, aged twenty-five. How many people resided in La Harpe in 1838 is unknown; they must have been few, as indeed they have always been, for the village had a population of nine hundred in 1864 and has but slightly over a thousand at the present time.

The new town had been laid out near the northern boundary of the county, twelve miles from the river, and it was in a region known as Hancock Prairie, which must have appeared most strange to New England eyes. According to J. M. Peck's *Gazetteer of Illinois,* published in Philadelphia in 1837, as an aid to possible immigrants:

> Hancock Prairie, from twelve to twenty miles in width, runs from south to north through this county. On the east, it is watered by the branches of Crooked Creek; and on the southwest, by Bear; and on the northwest, by Camp Creek. This county in the aggregate is deficient in timber. The banks of Bear Creek furnish a supply for that portion of the county. A strip lines the bank of the Mississippi, in some places of considerable width and of excellent quality—in other places narrow and of inferior quality. A toler-

> ably dense settlement extends along the line of this timber. Crooked Creek furnishes a due proportion of timber and prairie, and a body of excellent land. (p. 107)

Whether the founders of La Harpe village believed it to be more healthful to build their homes away from the ague-infested river region, or whether they realized that the prairie would make the best farm land is unknown. Perhaps earlier settlers had made that discovery for them. In the Thirties the old practice of avoiding the open prairie was being abandoned. They were not seeking homesites where timber must be cleared before fields could be cultivated, for the superior advantages of prairie land had been discovered.

It is certain, in any event, that William Smith was well established in La Harpe by 1838 and was already interested in many local economic activities. He had farm lands, although he seems always to have lived in the village; he had some sort of store or shop, possibly a general store; and he seems to have traded with the farmers, accepting various commodities, especially salt pork, for sale down the river. In time he had a grist and flour mill, and bought and sold horses, mules, and all sorts of farm equipment. A later *Gazetteer* lists him as an insurance agent. When one considers the size of the town, it appears that the transplanted Yankee lived up to the general reputation for men from his native state of being a "jack of all trades." And he made a good thing of it, too, as letters of a later period show, for his family lived well, the children were well educated, and the estate left at his death was a sizable one for that day and region.

Among the papers wrapped together and marked "Elizabeth Stearns Smith" there are two items that give some clue as to the preparations for her wedding and for the new life in the West. One is a bill from a shop in Peterborough, dated July 18, 1838, listing calico, sheeting, bedticking, and handkerchiefs; the other is a shopping list for an excursion to Boston to purchase furniture, china, silverware, and a trousseau. But the most illuminating items—so far as the personality and interests of the bride are concerned—come on the last page of the list, where she noted among the things to be purchased in Boston: Harriet Martineau's *Retrospect of Western Travel,* Carlyle's *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays,* Bancroft's *History of the United States,* the Reverend J. Whitman's *Young Lady's Aid,* Mrs. Caroline Gilman's *Poetry of Traveling in the United States,* and *Letters from Palmyra* and *Letters from Rome.* Who but a New England woman with her

rearing would have approached the frontier with silver sugar tongs and salt spoons, and with Miss Martineau's experience to guide her?

The bride took with her into Hancock Prairie all her treasures, determined to make the rest of the details of pioneer domestic life measure up to them as far as it might be possible. Hard work she did not fear, loneliness she had yet to experience, but it was with an indomitable will that she faced the leveling influence of the frontier. In many of Elizabeth's letters from Illinois there is evidence that she kept her resolution to hold for herself and her children the cultural standards of her own upbringing.

The letters which have been preserved tell nothing of the wedding, and little of the long journey. The bride and groom traveled by stage-coach across Pennsylvania, and by boat down the Ohio to its juncture with the Mississippi, then upstream to Quincy, the nearest river port to the new home. Few letters have been preserved for the months which followed. The first letter from Illinois bears the date of August 2, 1839. In that interval Elizabeth and her husband must have lived at the local tavern or hotel, or with friends, while their house was being built. She wrote that they "took possession of the new habitation the fourth of July—so that by this time, as you may suppose, we have got all things assigned, and I begin to consider myself a regular housekeeper."

The New Englander's contempt for the shiftless settlers who had reached Illinois from Kentucky and the South via Indiana is evidenced by her description of their reaction to some of her household activities:

> I have been busy getting things into place and this week have been giving the finishing touch by painting — which occasions a good deal of surprise among some of the Suckers. They come in and say "Well I never saw a woman paint before." And William very gravely tells them "Oh, yes, that is the trade my wife followed at the East."

The mosquitoes and the houseflies, noted with so much distress by many of those who wrote of western travel, were mentioned by young Mrs. Smith in many letters. And the bilious attacks, ague, and malaria that were a part of the season of acclimatization received due attention. She congratulated herself that their home was on the prairie away from the noxious river, and that the terrific heat of the cornbelt summer was made less "insupportable" by the "constant breeze from the open prairie."

This first letter ended with greetings to all the Peterborough and Jaffrey families and the hope that "all the children will not forget me." It was dispatched to Boston by a friend who was starting on a journey thither, in order that half the postage of twenty-five cents might be saved. On the nineteenth of August—seventeen days after it was written—the letter received the stamp of the Boston post office, and began the short leg of its journey to New Hampshire.

A month later William's sister Caroline, who had been spending the year in the West visiting first one and then another of the families from New Hampshire, sent a long letter East to the Smith family there. The letter is full of details about the health and prosperity of family and friends. She mentioned Elizabeth and William in La Harpe, and said that they were "well and living as snug and comfortable as if they were at the East."

Caroline recalled with pleasure the fact that she had had the opportunity, in St. Louis, to hear Unitarian preaching for the first time since she reached the Middle West, and she noted, with a touch of humor:

> I am glad they tolerate our sect in Missouri though they don't the *Mormons*. That persecuted people are all around us. They are trying to build up Zion, as they call it, at Commerce [later called Nauvoo], a town about ten miles above Montebello on the river. They have purchased the most of the town and have sent out their twelve apostles to convert the world. I am sure I had no thought of being near Zion here. You are not so favored at the East.

The business affairs of William Smith offer some interesting glimpses of the economics of frontier living. In a letter to his brother, John, of Peterborough, written in October, 1839, he took up a complicated matter of a shipment of window sashes which had been sent from New Hampshire to New Orleans by coasting vessel, and then up the river to La Harpe by steamboat. Difficulties had arisen because the wood had been damaged in transit, and a lawsuit had resulted in which the Smith firm seems to have had the better case. The funds from the sale of the window sash material, together with money consigned to him when he was in the East in 1838, William Smith was to invest in Western lands for his New Hampshire relatives. He wrote:

> We did not get home last fall in season for the land sales. Of course I had not an opportunity of profitably disposing of the funds I brought on. I have loaned out the money at twelve

per cent with the understanding that it is to be paid in when the land comes into the market in the Territory [Iowa]. It was to have been sold in this month, but the sale is postponed until next March. I shall then be able to loan out my money as well as that sent out to me by Mr. Stearns and Mr. Ainsworth at twenty-five per cent for four or five years (interest annually) secured by entering the land in my own name on which there is improvement giving them [the borrowers] a bond for a deed by they complying with the specified payments. I have bought the 160 acres of timber land of Doctor Foster's brother, for which I paid him 800 dollars, five dollars per acre. I have paid Uncle Jer. 200 dollars on that note by the way of E. Fulsome, and I have agreed with Fulsome to have his friend in Exeter pay the interest on the remaining 1800 dollars on the day due, and he has received a letter from his friends promising to do it punctually at the day. I advanced the money to Fulsome here to enter land. His friends were to furnish him money to do the same [to repay Mr. Smith?] the 200 dollars I received from you in 1837 I put into my own company here in La Harpe on which you are entitled to twelve per cent interest annually. I have built a house this summer which cost me about 200 dollars, and I intend to put up a barn and woodhouse this fall, the cost of the whole will be about 400 dollars and will make us very comfortable.

Such were the annals of a successful frontier businessman who was concerned as much with land speculation for himself and his friends as he was with the mercantile business. The high interest rates and the devious methods of providing for the payment of interest and capital indicate the banking and currency problems of the West. The letter ends with news of family and friends, and with a résumé of the "fever and ague" situation during the past summer.

There is but one letter for the year 1840—written by Elizabeth to her sister Susan (Mrs. John Smith, whose husband and Elizabeth's were brothers)—and that is devoted to her sorrow at the death of her father, and to a description of her first child, a boy then six months old. No letters for the first half of 1841 have been preserved. Some time during those months Baby Harry died, and a second son, William, was born to Elizabeth; Caroline Smith gave up all thought of returning to New Hampshire and became engaged to a fellow-New Englander whose name was Reynolds; and William started off on his annual trip down the Mississippi on a flatboat to exchange the product of the year's trading enterprises for commodities to be sold in his store.

The first letter of the four dated 1841 is from William, begun in

Memphis, Tennessee, on May 22 and continued on succeeding days as the flatboat made its way down river. The information it contains on the marketing methods of the day is worth recording. Elizabeth had left La Harpe with her husband, and was to spend the weeks that were necessary for his expedition visiting friends in St. Louis. Her husband's letter begins:

> As we shall stop at Memphis a few hours I will improve that opportunity to send you a line, giving you some account of our progress down the river. We left St. Louis at ten Sunday, Monday passed the Barracks, a pleasant place on the Missouri side of the river, hauled up for the night about 40 miles below St. Louis and tied our floating ark to the willows. Monday we ran between 50 and 60 miles and landed for the night 16 miles below Chester, Tuesday ran about 50 miles and landed for the night on a small island, and Wednesday ran only about 30 miles in daylight, owing to the Ohio River being very high and backing its waters up the Mississippi nearly 20 miles, passed the mouth of the Ohio about 7 o'clock this evening and found the river very high and the current very strong and the bed of the river full to overflowing and running frequently over the banks into the woods. . . .
>
> Saturday we arrived at Memphis on the 4th Chickasaw Bluffs at 11 A. M., making 410 miles below St. Louis. Not finding a boat at Memphis, and having no chance of disposing of any of our produce there, we left Sunday morning at 2 o'clock and hauled up for the night at St. Francis River about 70 miles beyond. The rain fell in torrents during the night. We sold no produce there, left Monday Morning and landed at ———— [?] in the afternoon and found no sale there. Ran all night on Tuesday and passed the mouth of White River and landed for the night at ———— [?] at the mouth of the Arkansas River—quite a place of business, sold some produce there. Left Wednesday morning and made a number of calls and sold some of our produce occasionally. Ran all night, made no calls on Thursday, passed some fine plantations, but some of them about four or five feet below the surface of the River and protected from inundation by embankments and the water nearly on a level with the top of the bank. Ran all night and on Friday morning passed Vicksburg but was not able to make a safe landing there. . . .

And so on down the river, stopping to trade whenever there seemed opportunity. The last entry in the letter was from Bayou Sarah nearly three weeks after the flatboat had set out from St. Louis. The account of the expedition ends with the statement that the writer did "not much like the flat-boat calling and the inconveniences that accompany it, but

it gives a person an opportunity of seeing a good deal of the world and learning much of the nature of the people that are in it." From Bayou Sarah to New Orleans was one hundred and fifty miles, and William held out hope that business there could be completed quickly, and that a steamboat could be found to carry him back home again.

In July, 1841, Caroline, now Mrs. Reynolds, wrote to her sister-in-law, Susan Smith, telling of her own marriage—in the church in Denmark, Iowa—and of the preparation of her new home in La Harpe, for "I followed the fashion of the country, got married first, and then got ready." Her house had two large rooms with an unfinished chamber above, and was described as "quite a good one for this country." Housekeeping, Caroline thought, would be easy and interesting, for,

> We persue the Graham system to some extent in living and use no tea and coffee. I like it quite well. My husband is a dyspeptic at present. He has not yet recovered from his almost fatal illness of last season, but hopes to do so by a strict adherence to the rules of health.

Having thus disposed of her own affairs, Caroline turned to those of other members of the family. Elizabeth and William had returned from their long absence during which William had made the rather unprofitable trip to New Orleans. After some description of that expedition the letter ends with an account of a visit to the Mormon settlement at Nauvoo:

> It is indeed the "city of wonders," and draws a great many visitors from curiosity. It is the finest location for a town I have seen on the river, and if they carry out their plans the temple which they are erecting will be the "wonder of the West." It is beautifully situated on a bluff a mile from the river and commands the finest prospect I have ever seen. They are building it of hewed stone. Its dimensions I do not remember, but it is larger than any other in the country, and is to be an exact imitation of a temple spoken of by one of the Prophets. We saw the twelve oxen, carved from wood, as large as life, which are designed to support the baptismal fount in the temple. Old things are to be restored again, but time or room would fail me to speak of all their absurdities. They make great use of the Scriptures and turn every mysterious passage to their advantage, particularly the Revelations so dark to other Christians. There has been great excitement here, with regard to their intentions in arming, but I hope nothing serious will be the result. You know, I suppose that we are right

in the midst of them. More than half of our town has joined them —but enough of the "Mormons."

Seven months later — in February, 1842 — the Mormons figured prominently in another letter from Caroline to her sister-in-law:

> We had a good laugh at the report you heard of William's being a Mormon. It was without the least foundation. I know of no one less likely to become one. Tell Father that revelations by dreams is one of the peculiar characteristicks of Mormonism and may be the next thing we hear will be that you are all becoming converts to the new faith. There would be one consideration which would help to reconcile me to it, that is, that it would bring you all into our immediate neighborhood, for this place is to be one of the "Stakes" (as they term it) of the great church. But it is too serious a matter for joking. What is the world coming to? We may well ask, when such doctrines find so many followers. We are in the very midst of them, yet the excitement is dying away, and I presume that we think less of them than you do to whom the subject is new. Their church here numbers nearly one-half of the town, and has some few influential members, Dr. Coulson among the number—you may have heard Wm. speak of him as one of the most intelligent of our citizens. His joining them excited our surprise and sorrow, as his example has no doubt influenced others to do likewise. He was one of the few who embraced Unitarianism two years ago, and we regret it the more on that account.

With the year 1842, the Illinois letters cease for some time. A few months later Elizabeth's third son, Jonathan, was born, and in the summer of 1843 she and both her little boys were sent back to New Hampshire for the long promised and desired visit. Five years had elapsed since she had started for the West as a bride. In those years her father and other relatives had died, the little children she had loved had grown out of all recognition, new babies had been born, and other changes had come into the lives of the loved ones of whom she thought so often. A year at "home" was to be a joy and a privilege beyond evaluation, for in all her long life Elizabeth was never to feel anything but an exile away from New England.

None of Elizabeth's letters to her husband in 1843 has been preserved and there is only one for 1844. There are, however, five long letters written to her by William at intervals of two months. The first includes a discussion of his Mormon neighbors and their pretensions. He was always willing to make financial gain at their expense and evi-

dently felt a sort of reluctant admiration and approval of them as builders of the West in which he, too, had a stake. In this letter to his wife he told of a visit to the near-by town of Augusta where he heard a Mormon preacher discourse on the glories that lay in the future for that vicinity when he should bring to it Mormons from every part of the earth—"He said that *Joseph* had blest it and that it was destined to become a mighty *City*." William Smith's host in Augusta was so impressed that he invited the Mormon and all the dignitaries of the place to dine with him:

> And [he] made a great feast with all of the fat things of the West. . . . We demolished his turkeys, chickens, and other little *nicknacks* with the utmost harmony and good feeling — all in anticipation of the future greatness of Augusta. . . . I sold there three lots for 250 dollars, so you see the excitement did some good, but whether it will equal the anticipations I have some serious doubts.

There was a bit of amusement and a sly dig at the New Hampshire family in William's remark that the Mormon missionary had told him that he had preached in Peterborough and "built up a society of Mormons there of 125 members." But it was with chagrin that the founder of La Harpe, who was a Clay and Webster Whig, noted:

> Our election took place last Monday and the Mormons carried all before them. Hyram Smith, the Patriarch, had a revelation on the subject — that all the good and faithful should support the Democratic ticket. This had the desired effect—they supported the ticket, almost to a man. The Prophet declared on the stand at Nauvoo that he had never had a political revelation himself because he had never asked the Lord for one, and he could not tell whether Hyram's was true or not, but this much he did know, that he had been acquainted with his brother Hyram for a long time and never knew him to tell a lie—as for himself, he did not intend to take part in politics, and as for the two political parties, for what he cared, they might go to *hell*.

In October William Smith wrote a long account of the state of his business. He was rapidly improving the farm that he managed himself, and was bringing more and more land under cultivation on that farm and another which he rented out "on shares." He was making every effort to sell enough farm land and town lots to pay every debt, and to send back to his brother and to other relatives in the East the funds entrusted to him for investment. By December, when he wrote again,

he had sold his share in a grist and flour mill in "the Territory," and had taken mortgages on the mill for the $5,400 owed to him. He had sold farms and village lots along the road leading to Nauvoo. Twenty-five dollars was the price received for several one-acre lots. In another transaction fifty-three acres brought $425. A twenty-acre field near La Harpe sold for $20 an acre, and he sold for $75 a four-acre plot to be used for a brickyard. The fact that these pieces of property were widely scattered furnishes evidence of the extent of his holdings, and the prices listed for such transfers must have been the current rates for that locality in the Forties. Unimproved land, therefore, purchased a decade before for $1.25 an acre, now had a sale value of about $5.00 to $8.00 per acre, while one-acre building lots in or near the village brought about $20. A few of the payments were in money, some were in "property" or commodities, and the rest were in "time notes" at ten per cent, secured by the land.

William and his partners in Smith and Company were still interested in trading down the river, especially in salt pork, and he wrote that "Mr. Reynolds and myself are putting up some pork. We have the kettles in the wash-room and have had doors made to the wood-house to have it all shut up to pack our pork. We expect to put up about 100 barrels." So important was his business through St. Louis that in this letter he broached the subject of selling all his La Harpe interests, and of moving the whole household to the Missouri settlement after Elizabeth's return. That project evidently did not prove feasible, for there is no further reference to it, and the next letter, dated January 9, 1844, is again filled with his loneliness during the absence of his wife and children and, at the same time, with the assurance of his approval and understanding of their prolonged stay in the East, and his willingness to subordinate his own desires to their best interests.

Elizabeth had sent him a packet of books by one of the St. Louis friends who had been on a visit in the East, and William wrote that he had been much gratified in their perusal:

> Mr. Adams' letters are replete with good sense and Mrs. Bremers two works are very excellent. Domestic happiness is more beautifully portrayed than I have ever seen before. Those works abundantly confirm my previous opinions on that subject—that if a heaven of happiness is to be enjoyed on the earth, it must proceed from the well-regulated influence of the domestic circle. I look upon the good wife as the most important personage in adorning that circle—she is to it what the sun is to the natural

world. When it shines how beautiful it is to all within! Her husband, children and domestics merely act as her satellites to reflect their borrowed light on society around. If this be a correct view of the case as I verily believe, how great must be the darkness to the good husband when that luminary absents herself for almost a year from that domestic circle.

At some time during the early part of 1844, Elizabeth Smith's baby, Jonathan, fell ill and died. Even this disaster did not make William feel that it would be possible for him to go east for Elizabeth and Willie, and in the early summer she set out for Illinois, with only her vigorous and active little boy to accompany her. Part of the way she was with friends and relatives—her sister Fidelia went to Boston with her and saw her off on the boat for New York; other relatives met her there; and somewhere farther west she was met by an acquaintance from Denmark, Iowa, who acted as escort for the trip on the Ohio and Mississippi rivers.

There is extant the long letter that Elizabeth wrote day by day to her sisters as the wearisome journey progressed. It is well worth reading in full as a chronicle of a day when the hazards of travel were great and the conveniences and amenities negligible:

CINCINNATI,
July 3rd, 1844

MY DEAR SISTERS:

As we are detained here today I thought it would be a good opportunity to give you some account of our progress thus far. We arrived here night before last and have been expecting to leave every hour since. Are on board the steamboat, *Lexington,* other boats continually coming and going. The noise, bustle, and confusion of all on board make it a perfect *Babel*—not the best place in the world to sit down and write. This delay, too, is extremely unpleasant. We should have been nearly at St. Louis by this time, if we had gone directly on as we expected. With my anxiety to reach home, and not feeling very well I am completely out of patience with this want of fidelity in the steamboat captains.

But I am beginning at the wrong end of my story. Of our safe arrival at Boston you will have heard by Sister Fidelia, and that we did not leave there till Tuesday P. M.—got into New York the next morning at 7 o'clock—had rather a poor night, for our luggage was all put into the car and could not be got at until we landed—so Willie and I had to sleep what we could without undressing. Willie was quite unwell in the morning, vomiting and quite feverish. I deliberated some time whether to go on, or go and find Uncle Doctor, but concluded not to stop as he did not

grow any worse. He continued sick at times through the day, but I kept him without eating and he was well the next day.

At New York we took tickets to Pittsburgh on the mail line, arrived in Philadelphia a little after noon the same day and were detained until the next morning. They told us that the agent at New York was not authorized to give us tickets to go on the mail line, and we must wait till the next day's train. The weather was very warm, we rode in the cars all day—stopped at Harrisburg, took another train to Chambersburgh where the railroad terminates about 120 miles from Philadelphia—arrived there at dark and took the stage for Pittsburgh a distance of 150 miles—all the way over the mountains. The stage was very much crowded, 12 passengers, 4 inside beside Willie and the coach very small, all gentlemen except one, an Irish girl fresh from the Emerald Isle. I thought our prospect for spending two days and nights in this way was not a very pleasant one—however we made out to get through better than I expected. The nights were beautiful, almost as light as day. I got out to walk frequently. The first night I got no sleep. The second slept a little. There is some beautiful, or rather grand, scenery in crossing the mountains which is some compensation for the fatigue though one does not feel in the best mood to enjoy it. Willie seemed to stand the stage-riding better than any of us. I suppose it was because he slept more. He lay in the bottom of the stage among the boots and dirt and slept all night. He is never tired asking questions and talks freely with any one he meets.

We got into Pittsburgh Saturday P. M. at 5 o'clock, pretty well used up, though I felt better than I expected. We were fortunate enough to find a boat just going out, for this place—a fine new boat, the *United States Revenue,* we went on board, and left that evening. After a good night's rest I felt much refreshed, found some pleasant company, a family from Washington going out to Burlington, Iowa, and a lady with a little boy just the age of my dear one and more like him than any child I have ever seen. It was a pleasure to look at him, and I was sorry to have them leave the boat the next day. We had a very pleasant passage and arrived here Monday night. We were sorry to leave the other Boat, we do not like the looks of things half as well on board this one. It is not new and nice, and we are almost eaten up with Musketoes and every kind of *vermin,* but I will not complain if they carry us safe through.

Louisville July 4. Here we are in port again spending the 4th — very much against the wishes of all the passengers — and entirely for the gratification of the officers of the Boat. The weather is extremely warm—a year ago today I spent very near where I now am, how many sad recollections I have of my journey on to New England—almost everything reminds me of my dear

lost one. *Evening*—We left Louisville just before night—came over the falls instead of going through the canal—as the river is quite high. I never have felt so timid in all my experience in steamboating. The whirling and commotion of the water looked frightful at least to me. I went so far as to get out my life preserver and inflate it. We touched the rocks once, but got over well.

St. Louis Tuesday 9th. We have had a long and tedious passage from Louisville. Our Boat was heavily laden and rather slow, and when we got into the Mississippi the current was so strong that we could not go more than 4 or 5 miles an hour—everything seemed to conspire to make our passage an unpleasant one. The weather was very warm. I never experienced anything like it before, and the two last days we had nothing to quench our thirst but the warm muddy water of the river, without any ice, and to drink it was like taking a dose of medicine. Our Captain took a great supply of ice, but it wasted so fast that it soon gave out, and none could be obtained after we got into the Mississippi—indeed, it seemed as though the few inhabitants there were left could hardly support life much less enjoy any of its luxuries. Such scenes of desolation and wretchedness as every where met our view, were never before seen. The houses deserted and in most cases under water, the people sometimes living in flat-boats, made fast to the trees, beside what was once their home. The river always did appear anything but pleasant to me, but now it seemed some monster of evil bent on ruin and destruction. The water, though still very high, was some 5 or 6 feet lower than it had been. I suffered much from fear, perhaps more than was necessary, but I thought if anything should happen to the boat there would be no chance of escape as there was no place to land except in the tops of the trees.

I never was more glad to see any place than I was to see St. Louis—arrived here yesterday morning, was much disappointed at not finding William here, but suppose he did not get my letter in season as the mails have been very irregular since the floods in the West—found the friends all well here, Ellen said she had just been writing to some of the Eastern friends. I presume her mother will think that she has sufficient excuse for not going on this season. The boat that we are to go in, was to have gone yesterday afternoon, and then at 10 o'clock this morning, but here we are yet, expect now to go this evening. I feel very impatient to get home. If I should get there in safety, I think I shall not soon leave it again, but I have stood the journey thus far better than I expected. Willie was quite unwell one or two days. I was very much afraid he was going to be sick, but he seems pretty well now. . . . I intended to have finished this letter here and sent it, but thought, as William was not here, I would wait till I got home, and let you see me to the end of my journey and how they are at home.

La Harpe July 18th, Thursday. I feel very sorry to have delayed so long sending this letter, I fear you will feel somewhat anxious before you get it, but it has been unavoidable. The next day after I got home Willie was taken sick and I did not wish to write until he got better, and I now send this in the first mail since his recovery. We landed at Fort Madison a week ago this morning, having been two nights and one day coming from St. Louis. We had quite a good passage up, most of the same companions that we had had all the way from Pittsburgh. We had a nice new boat, the river was not as high, and it was much more pleasant above the mouth of Missouri & Illinois. It was encouraging to find the aspect of things improving as I got nearer home. The last night we were on the boat however Willie took a bad cold. The lady that occupied the stateroom with me wished to sleep with the outer door open. I waked about 12 o'clock and found Willie very hoarse and was quite alarmed, got up and gave him Hines Syrup until he vomited and watched him till morning when he appeared some better, but still his cough had a very bad sound. We left the boat at 7 o'clock. Mr. Fore thought I had better go home with him which I was rather unwilling to do as I wished very much to reach home that day—but there seemed to be no other way than for me to go to Denmark—we found the people there all well, staid two or three hours— and I set out for home with Charles. The sun was scorching hot, and the roads almost impassable from the floods of rain. As we landed from the Ferry on this side, who should we meet there but William. I need not tell you of my joy, it seemed as though I had already got home. Some of our travelling companions said they would like to see our meeting, but I assured them there was very little *romance in real life.*

We reached home a little after dark, found all in usual health —and if I can judge from appearances, they were as glad to see me as I am to be once more at home. Willie's cold was quite bad that night, but I thought the croup symptoms had mostly disappeared and was quite easy about him. The next day he was not quite as well—and towards night grew quite feverish. The next day, Saturday, he was very sick—a high fever and very much pressed for breath. I never have seen him appear so sick and have never been so much alarmed about him, he breathed much as my baby did in his last sickness—the lungs seemed to be very much oppressed and the cough returned as bad as ever. This with being very bilious made him appear very sick. The doctor gave him calomel and other powerful medicine—and at the end of the second day he began to be somewhat better—since that he has been gaining and is now tolerably well, except a bad cough. He has lost a great deal of flesh, but I hope is better prepared for the sickly season. My own health is quite good since I got over the fatigue of the journey, and my anxiety for Willie. Caroline appears pretty well,

though not quite as much so as we could wish. . . . I have many more things to say but you see I cannot write more now.

Let us hear from you soon, your affectionate Sister,

E. S. Smith

In the years after the long visit in New England there were fewer letters written, and of those few only about one for each year has been preserved for us. The Illinois family faced many financial difficulties in this period, and the high hopes with which they had made their homes on the frontier seemed doomed to disappointment. The area on both sides of the Mississippi between Quincy, Illinois, and Burlington, Iowa, which had experienced such a boom with the settlement of nearly fifteen thousand Mormons, went through a long period of depression after the departure of that sect in 1845. William Smith had done a thriving business selling lands, farm equipment, and provisions to the Mormons, and found his affairs hopelessly tangled when they were forced to seek another "Stake in Zion" in the Far West. In the summer of 1845 he fell ill with "fever and ague" and spent three months in bed. All talk of leaving La Harpe was at an end, and upon his recovery, he set to work to put his affairs into shape with a feeling that speculative enterprises had better be avoided for the future. The Iowa mill came back into his hands and needed careful management. He had large farm holdings that could not now be sold to advantage, and his town lots were no longer in demand. It was some years before his affairs were in good order again, but when in 1850 Elizabeth wrote that they were at last building a new and much more commodious house, it was evident that the storm had been weathered, and that their financial difficulties were at an end.

Elizabeth could have had little time to write in those years even if she had been free from worry in regard to her husband's health and finances, for her family cares were unceasing. In 1845 the little daughter she so greatly desired was born, but she died within that year. The letters still in existence do not mention her name or any of the circumstances of her short life, but only the ache in the mother's heart when she writes of the girl children of friends and sisters. Two years later her fifth child, a boy, was born, and he, too, died in infancy. In 1849 a second Jonathan arrived. He was followed by Albert and, in 1854, by the eighth and last child, the long-awaited daughter, Elizabeth.

Caroline Smith Reynolds and her husband continued to live in La Harpe for some years, and their two children, a boy and a girl, were

born there. In the early Fifties they moved to Keokuk, Iowa, but they were often with the Smiths for long visits. Josiah Stearns, Elizabeth's older brother, seems to have been a rolling stone. He spent some time in Illinois but finally settled in Canada. The St. Louis cousins seem to have prospered, and a daughter of the Denmark, Iowa, branch of the family married a Chicago businessman with wealth and social standing.

In December, 1852, Elizabeth wrote a letter to her sister Susan that throws some light upon various aspects of her life. Included was a paragraph on western schools, or the lack of them.

> Willie has been to school so long where there was no order or discipline that he has acquired bad habits for study. I hope, however, he is making some *little* improvement this winter, but he is very wayward and indolent. He ought to be under the tuition of some one that will be strict. We have been thinking some of sending him from home another season, if we could find a suitable place. There is no school in this vicinity of the right kind. Does Mr. Brown of Brattleborough continue to take boys to educate as he did a few years ago? His father thinks he would have more confidence in him than in any one else. The only objection in my mind is that it is too far away. Willie needs so much looking after I don't know how he would get along away from home, and yet if he could be under the care of some judicious person, perhaps it would be the best thing we could do for him. Tell Frances I wish she would write me all about the school at Brattleborough and all about other matters respecting yourselves of which I wish so much to hear.

The education of her "wayward" son was not the only problem that Elizabeth discussed with her sister. The process of writing this long letter was stretched over several days because of household difficulties. She had had a big New Year's Day party. She wrote:

> It always seems a great task for me to have company, especially a large number of invited guests, for I have everything to do for myself, and it is rather making *toil of pleasure*. Hardly a week passes but we have more or less company, but it is generally people from out of town. Mr. Smith has extensive acquaintance, and *hospitality* is considered one of the cardinal virtues among Western people.

And hospitality when there was no help in the kitchen was no easy matter for the western housewife whose trousseau had included silver sugar tongs and salt spoons! So far as service was concerned, she had whatever could be procured. There was no period in her mar-

ried life when a maid in the kitchen or a nursegirl for the children could not have been paid had it been possible to secure them, but servants were seldom to be found in the West, and housewives "got along" with whatever "help" they could get. The letters are full of references to drives into the country to secure a farmer's daughter for a few months' assistance. A niece or a cousin occasionally "helped" for a season, but more often the housewife faced alone the work of providing for the comfort of her family. In 1852 she had a "young girl about 12. She has been with me since last summer, and her mother wishes me to keep her until she is eighteen, but I don't know whether I can have patience. She is very ignorant and rather stupid, though sometimes is a good deal of help and is pretty good with the children."

There is no record as to whether or not young William was sent to Mr. Brown's school in Vermont, but, apparently, the entire family went East for the summer of 1853, for a letter written early in 1854 mentions having had no family news "since our return." The next letter—the last of this slender collection—bears the date of June 8, 1857. Family cares, ill health, and a gradual weakening of the ties that bound her to the East seem to have led to a lengthening of the period between letters. Changes in the family circle in New Hampshire were additional causes for a disruption of correspondence. The old homestead was sold, William's father and mother died, Susan's children grew up and married, and the Civil War called many of the family into the army. For some reason whoever had been responsible for the preservation of the letters from the West ceased to save them, and one source for information about Elizabeth Stearns Smith and her family was exhausted.

There are neither diaries nor letters for the following years. A few items of interest in regard to the family can be obtained from other sources. La Harpe remained the family home. The boys were sent to the academy connected with Knox College in Galesburg, Illinois, and later to the college. As little Elizabeth grew older she was placed in a boarding school in Quincy, and eventually followed her brothers to Knox Academy. William Smith, their father, seems never to have sought political office himself, but he was the leading Whig and later the leading Republican of his community, and at his house were entertained most of the traveling political celebrities of his day. His daughter Elizabeth remembered, as an old lady, the gala occasion when Abraham Lincoln was their house guest in 1858 or 1859, and she triumphed

over her brother Albert in being invited to sit upon the great man's knee.

William Smith worshipped at the shrine of Daniel Webster and sent East, in the days of his affluence, to have an artist make a copy for him of one of the most famous of the portraits of Webster. The La Harpe house was gradually furnished with other objects of some value and beauty. In 1850 a family traveling West in the gold rush were forced to delay their journey in La Harpe because of the illness of one member. The Smiths took them in, nursed them back to health, and started them on toward their distant goal. When the gold seekers departed, they left behind with their hosts a beautiful tall clock that had been made by a seafaring ancestor of pre-Revolutionary days whose shore-time hobby had been clockmaking. When the Jaffrey and Peterborough homes in New Hampshire were sold, or went into the hands of relatives, the cherished family possessions were divided and a share of them went to Illinois. The La Harpe parlor welcomed an Empire sofa and side chairs and an antique mirror, while in the dining room Daniel Webster frowned down upon two beautiful semicircular tables. The china tea set of Elizabeth's trousseau was supplanted by one of silver of simple design and delicate chasing. And when the little daughter was old enough for lessons, a new piano replaced the old melodeon that had been her mother's pride. Altogether the years of Elizabeth's and William's middle age seem to have been pleasant ones, though few details of their passage remain for our examination.

William's business enterprises expanded with the years. He invested several thousand dollars in a milling business in Hamilton, Missouri. The mill was operated by steam power and seems to have been a success financially because a similar project was discussed for "somewhere in Minnesota" where wheat would be plentiful and cheap. Opening a bank was mentioned in later letters, and the family seems to have had some interest in the railroad which was built through La Harpe. In the Seventies William bought several hundred acres of land for his two sons, Jonathan and Albert, in western Minnesota, and carefully guided them through their first frontier venture.

In 1873 William Smith died of what was, apparently, a throat cancer, and a last anxious letter to the boys in Minnesota from their mother in La Harpe brings to an end the written record that began with the early diary of the thirteen-year-old New Hampshire schoolgirl. Mrs. Smith and Elizabeth remained in La Harpe until the family affairs

there were settled. Elizabeth went to Knox Academy for a term or two when her mother did not need her too desperately. Jonathan and Albert continued to manage the Minnesota farms which became their share of their father's estate, and they were joined there for at least one winter by their mother and sister. In the late Seventies they sold their holdings in Minnesota and moved on to South Dakota where they bought a large tract of land on which they had high hopes of making great profit. By that time they had both married, and when the crash in South Dakota values came with the drought and grasshoppers in the late Eighties, they were in difficult straits.

Jonathan went on to Tacoma, Washington, where he again indulged in land speculation, this time in town lots, for he believed that Tacoma and not Seattle would be the great western seaport. After years of difficulty he managed to retrieve his fortunes to some extent, and lived in comfort until well past eighty. Albert remained in a small town in South Dakota where his life was long and uneventful. For many years he held a minor county office which provided him with a livelihood. Of William, Jr., there is no source for information. He seems to drop out of the picture with the death of his father. The presumption is that he died soon after the La Harpe home was broken up, and that he never married.

Before 1880 Mrs. Smith left the Middle West never to return, and with her daughter went East to live with relatives in Jaffrey, New Hampshire, and in Amherst, Massachusetts. Elizabeth completed her musical studies in Boston, and, when she and her mother were visiting Rear Admiral and Mrs. Green (Mrs. Green was the daughter of the Sister Mary of the early diaries), she met a young instructor in Amherst College, John Tyler, the son of the Professor of Greek of that institution. In 1883 they were married, in the old Ainsworth parsonage in Jaffrey. Mrs. Smith used the money left her by her husband to build a house for the young couple, and Professor Tyler gave them the land at the foot of the little hill on which stood his own pre-Revolutionary house in Amherst. With them, in that new house, she lived in comfort for the final years of her life. The last picture of her was taken with her grandson and shows a slender little old lady with white corkscrew curls and a determined mouth and chin, firmly clutching a rolypoly child of two. She was buried in the Tyler lot in the Amherst Cemetery, but one feels that she might rest with greater contentment back in her New Hampshire hills.

Smith and Stearns—in the early nineteenth century those names had represented tough stock of Scotch-Irish and English origin. Both Elizabeth and William Smith were members of large families of vigorous children. Of their eight children only three lived to maturity and married. There were five grandchildren and only four great-grandchildren. Such was the history, too, of many of their brothers and sisters, and such is the story of other New England families, but in the years of their strength they did much to make America.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS

1942

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

To the Directors and Members of the Illinois State Historical Society:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I present herewith a summary of the activities of the Illinois State Historical Society since its last annual meeting, held at Rock Island on May 8-10, 1941.

You will recall that at the last annual meeting a number of changes were made in the Society's constitution. By one of these the date of the annual meeting, formerly restricted to the month of May, was left to the discretion of the Board of Directors. Meeting on September 26, 1941, the Board decided that the next annual meeting should be held in early October, 1942, and that each spring the Society should sponsor a field trip or historical tour.

By general agreement, a tour of northwestern Illinois, terminating at Galena, was scheduled for a suitable date in May, 1942. But between September, 1941, and May, 1942, many events which do not need to be related here took place. It was soon apparent that the tour which had been planned could not be held, and there was a division of opinion on the question whether a one-day visit to Galena should be attempted. In a dilemma, the Secretary polled the Society's membership and received enough favorable responses to justify the attempt. The event itself turned out far better than anyone anticipated. Eighty-five members of the Society attended, toured the historic little city on foot, and in general spent a pleasant, informative day. The experience dissipated whatever doubts regarding the expediency of the meeting had been entertained, for all who attended expressed gratitude for a day free from the punishing pressure of the world at war.

At the Society's last annual meeting I reported that the membership was 1,030. On September 25, 1942, it stood at 1,006, a net loss of 24. That loss, however, should be no reflection upon the Society's membership activities, which have been carried forward so effectively that 171 new members have been added since May, 1941. The loss is accounted for in part by the deaths of 34 members, but mainly by a much stricter policy regarding cancellation of memberships for nonpayment of dues. Formerly it was the policy to retain delinquent

members on the active list for as long as four or five years after their last dues payment. Gradually that interval was shortened. This year we cancelled, on May 15, all memberships unpaid for the year 1941. Moreover, we propose to cancel all 1942 unpaid memberships on November 1 of the present year, and to follow that practice in the future. While a closer control of this kind is being instituted a drop in membership is inevitable, but the result will be a sounder, more active membership than the Society has enjoyed for many years.

Our present membership of 1,006 includes 257 members in Chicago, and 144 outside the state. The Chicago membership, though considerably larger than formerly, is still much smaller than it should be in view of the fact that more than half the population of Illinois is concentrated in Cook County.

You will remember that the Society's constitution, as amended at the last annual meeting, made provision for Institutional Memberships. All local historical societies in the state were sent notice of the new membership and its qualifications, and eighteen societies applied for and received certificates of membership.

At the special meeting of the Directors on September 26, 1941, Mr. Beyer presented the following report from the Policy Committee:

> On June 28, 1940, the policy committee of the Illinois State Historical Society met in Springfield, and drafted the statement of policy which appeared in the last issue of the *Journal*. It will be recalled that one of the objectives decided on was the encouraging of the teaching of Illinois history in the public schools of the state.
>
> In seeking ways to realize this objective, a conference was arranged in Springfield on July 25 of this year with Mr. C. C. Stadtman of the office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Mr. Angle and the writer conferred for nearly two hours with Mr. Stadtman, and explained that tests have revealed that even high school graduates have a woefully inadequate knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the history of this state. Mr. Stadtman was then asked what methods might best be undertaken by the Illinois State Historical Society to increase and improve the teaching of state history in the public schools.
>
> The possibility of introducing special courses in state history in the high school curriculum was discarded because of the fact that there are already numerous social studies courses being taught, and it would be difficult to introduce new ones. However, Mr. Stadtman suggested that state history could well be taught within the framework of existing courses in the secondary school curriculum. Three courses in particular lend themselves to the intro-

duction of Illinois history subject matter: American history, Civics, and Commercial Geography. There are endless opportunities to use the fresh material from the field of state history to illustrate, enliven, and localize the subject matter in these courses.

One reason for the neglect of state history in the public schools is the lack of bibliographical material for teachers. Ways of rectifying this were discussed. However, according to Mr. Stadtman, the greatest need in the public schools is for material on various phases of state history prepared in booklet form. Many topics could be handled in these booklets, and this literature would be most welcome in the public schools. Thus, a suitably written, attractively illustrated, authentic little book on "Transportation in Illinois" or "Frontier Industries" or "Abraham Lincoln" (Mr. Angle has a manuscript available here) would be well received in the schools. Mr. Stadtman suggested that these works be written so that they could be understood by children from the fifth grade upwards. Some of this literature would also be acceptable in the high schools. Mr. Stadtman concluded that one of the greatest services that the Illinois State Historical Society could perform (in connection with its desire to stress the teaching of state history in the schools) would be to prepare a number of these historical booklets and distribute them to the rural, city elementary, and high schools in the state. The possibility of some outside financial aid in the publication of these booklets was discussed, and while some assistance might be forthcoming, no definite decision was reached.

In view of the information secured in the conference of July 25, the chairman of the policy committee respectfully recommends the following to the Directors of the Illinois State Historical Society:

1. That the Society undertake the preparation of a series of booklets dealing with phases of Illinois history, and distribute them without charge to such schools in the state as would be interested in using them as teaching material.

2. That an Illinois history bibliography be prepared and be made available for teachers. This bibliography preferably should stress those books and articles which are readily accessible in the schools.

3. That the President of the Society appoint a committee which will have as a long range objective the composition of outlines of Illinois history subject matter which might be integrated or fused with the content of existing courses in American history, Civics, and Commercial Geography in the high schools.

Discussion brought out the fact that all members of the Board were strongly in favor of the program outlined above. Ways and means of financing the publications contemplated were discussed, the most likely possibility appearing to be the assumption of the cost of the first pamphlets by the Illinois State Historical Library.

It was agreed that in any case, the first step in the program was the preparation of several manuscripts, and it was also agreed that the Society's control over subject matter would be much surer if authors were given at least nominal compensation for their services.

After full discussion, it was moved by Mr. Stevens, seconded by Mr. Matheny and passed that the Society's budget be increased in the amount of $100, said sum to be used to pay four authors $25 each for manuscripts suitable for publication in the history pamphlet series.

It was understood that the further prosecution of the program for teaching Illinois history in the schools should be the responsibility of the Policy Committee and the Secretary. The suggestion of Professor Ander that the program be described at the forthcoming meeting of superintendents and principals at Urbana was discussed, but the general feeling was that such a presentation would be more timely after at least some material was available.

This report was approved by the Directors, and the Policy Committee was instructed to carry out its recommendations as far as practicable. As a first step in this direction, the committee invited several writers to contribute manuscripts suitable for use by elementary school children. Manuscripts on prehistoric Indians, on pioneer life in Illinois, and on the life of Abraham Lincoln were submitted, and accepted by the committee. However, before they could be printed the war intervened, and with it came the necessity of restricting the expenditures of the Illinois State Historical Library, from whose funds it was expected that the cost of printing — a sizable item — would be defrayed. The continuation of this phase of the program is dependent upon solution of the problem of printing cost.

As a second step, Mr. Beyer and your secretary undertook to prepare an outline of Illinois history which, while intended primarily for the use of high school history teachers, would also be found useful by many general readers. The outline took the form of topical statements of American history, followed by summary statements of parallel topics in Illinois history, and extensive bibliographies. We have had a number of meetings, and the outline is now complete except for a few of the bibliographical sections. The outline would have been finished long before this had it not turned out to be a much bigger undertaking than we anticipated. When finished, it will exceed one hundred pages, and this is in spite of our constant effort to keep it as simple and as short as possible. Many high school teachers have indicated an interest in

the outline, and I believe that it will cause much more attention to be devoted to Illinois history in the schools than has been the case in the past.

Several times in annual reports I have advocated that the Society sponsor a series of publications which would appeal to the layman. Such a series is gradually coming into existence through the medium of the biennial *Blue Book of Illinois*. The *Blue Book* for 1939-1940 contained a brief but well illustrated history of Illinois which I contributed; in the *Blue Book* for 1941-1942 was included a detailed chronology of Illinois history prepared by Miss Margaret Flint, reference librarian of the State Historical Library. Both articles have been reprinted separately and are available without charge. That they fill a need is evident. *The Story of Illinois* is now in its second edition and is in constant demand, not only by residents of Illinois, but by libraries and individuals in all parts of the country. I have no doubt that the same will be true of the chronology. Original publication in the *Blue Book* makes reprinting possible at very small cost.

Since the last meeting the Society's *Journal* has been issued as usual, and I am happy to say that there are many indications that it ranks high among publications of its kind. One such indication is the number of articles submitted for publication by ranking scholars, who do not, as a rule, seek publication in inferior media. The Society's other publication, *Papers in Illinois History,* has not appeared as promptly as it should have. In the past, the delay has been due in the main to the tardiness of contributors, but this year the fault rests primarily upon the Secretary. Publication of *Papers in Illinois History, 1941,* was held up so that the Illinois history outline, to which reference has already been made, might first appear there. (By this means much of the cost of separate publication can be saved.) Then, as has been stated, the outline was not finished as soon as was expected. The volume will go to press as soon as the outline can be completed.

I think that few members of the Society realize the extent of the public notice which the Society's publications receive. The Chicago press, for example, devoted considerable space to H. A. Musham's article on the Chicago fire in *Papers in Illinois History, 1940.* (That article, incidentally, led more people to join the Society than anything that we have published during the last ten years.) C. H. Cramer's sketch of Robert G. Ingersoll, published in the same volume, was reprinted in full in the *Peoria Star.* The history of Camp Lincoln, which

appeared in the *Journal* for September, 1941, was made the basis for a long article in the *Illinois State Register* of Springfield. Shorter references to the Society's publications by the press of the state are too numerous to mention. In general the Illinois State Historical Society gets far more press notice than a person who sees only one or two newspapers would assume.

Contributing, I hope favorably, to the Society's publicity are the activities of the Secretary. Since the last annual meeting I have appeared on the program of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, have spoken before the Bibliographical Society of America, the Graduate Library Institute of the University of Chicago, and the Evanston, Quincy, and Morgan County historical societies, and civic clubs in several cities. I have helped in the organization of the Western Chroniclers, Knox County's historical society, and have done what I could in behalf of a similar organization in Stephenson County. I have contributed numerous reviews to both scholarly and popular publications.

Respectfully submitted,

PAUL M. ANGLE.

ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING
ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS, OCTOBER 3, 1942

A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by Mr. Hauberg, president of the Society. On motion of Mr. Townley, seconded by Mr. Stevens, the reading of the minutes of the last meeting was dispensed with.

The Secretary then presented his report. On the motion of Mr. Stevens, seconded by Mr. Townley, the report was accepted and approved.

The Secretary stated that the Society had been invited by Chicago and Des Plaines to hold its next meeting in those cities. He expressed the opinion that a decision on the place of meeting should be deferred—that wartime restrictions on travel might make a meeting difficult if not impossible. On the motion of Dr. James, seconded by Dr. Clark, the question of the next annual meeting was referred to a committee consisting of the Society's President, Senior Vice President, and Secretary with power to act. Mr. Townley pointed out that the holding of an annual meeting was made obligatory by the Society's constitution. Those present at the meeting were unanimous in their conviction that the Society should continue its meetings regardless of the war.

The Secretary stated that the Society's annual publication, *Papers in Illinois History,* might have to be made a biennial publication, or perhaps be discontinued, if the printing appropriation of the Illinois State Historical Library were materially reduced.

Dr. James moved that the Secretary be requested to express the thanks of the Society to the Morgan County Historical Society, Illinois College, MacMurray College, and the Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce for their successful efforts to make the forty-third annual meeting one of the best in the Society's history. The motion, seconded by Dr. Clark, was passed.

Mr. Diller asked whether it would be in order for the Society to take an official position with reference to the removal of the monument and tomb of Stephen A. Douglas. After discussion, it was decided informally that the Society was not in possession of sufficient information to take any action.

The Secretary announced that Willard R. Matheny, upon entering the U. S. Army some months earlier, had asked that his resignation as a Director of the Society be submitted to the annual meeting. On the motion of Mr. Stevens, seconded by Dr. Clark, the resignation was accepted with regret.

Mr. Townley nominated Frank J. Heinl of Jacksonville for election to the unexpired term of Colonel Matheny. Mr. Heinl was elected by acclamation.

Mr. Hayward moved that the following Directors of the Society, whose terms expired in 1942, be re-elected:

James A. James..... Evanston
Hermon D. Smith..... Lake Forest
James G. Randall..... Urbana
John H. Hauberg..... Rock Island
Dwight F. Clark..... Evanston

Mr. Townley seconded the motion, which was passed by unanimous vote.

The meeting then adjourned.

MEETING OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY JACKSONVILLE, ILLINOIS, OCTOBER 3, 1942

Present: Dr. James, Dr. Clark, Mr. Hauberg, Mr. Heinl, Mr. Townley, Mr. Stevens, and Mr. Angle, secretary.

Mr. Victor W. Richter made a short talk supporting the invitation extended by the Des Plaines Historical Society. He was assured that the invitation would be given full consideration, but was informed that the transportation situation was so uncertain that a definite decision would not be made for several months.

Mr. Townley nominated Jewell F. Stevens for election to the presidency of the Society for the year 1942-1943. Mr. Stevens was elected by acclamation.

The following were nominated to the other offices of the Society, and elected by acclamation:

Wayne C. Townley..... Senior Vice President
Richard L. Beyer..... Vice President
Dwight F. Clark..... Vice President
Ernest E. East..... Vice President
Theodore C. Pease..... Vice President
George W. Smith..... Vice President
Paul M. Angle..... Secretary and Treasurer

The Secretary and Treasurer then presented a financial report showing receipts of $2,190.00 and disbursements of $1,689.20 for the period April 21, 1941, to August 31, 1942, and showing a balance of $7,294.87 as of August 31, 1942. The financial report was accepted and approved.

Mr. Stevens, from the auditing committee, presented the audit made by Miss Lucy C. Williams, September 30, 1942, which was accepted and placed on file.

On the motion of Mr. Heinl, seconded by Mr. Stevens, it was voted that the Society's fiscal year should begin with September 1 and end with the last day of August following.

Dr. James moved that the Secretary and Treasurer be authorized to defray the necessary traveling expenses of Directors attending this annual meeting and subsequent meetings of the Directors, either annual

or called. Mr. Heinl seconded the motion. After discussion, the motion was passed.

Mr. Hauberg moved that the 1942-1943 budget of the Society providing for total expenditures of $1,800 be approved as submitted by the Secretary and Treasurer. The motion was seconded by Dr. Clark and passed.

It was moved by Mr. Townley, seconded by Mr. Hauberg, and passed that the Secretary's salary be paid quarterly instead of semi-annually.

On the motion of Dr. James, seconded by Mr. Stevens, the Secretary was asked to communicate to Mrs. Logan Hay an appreciation of the services rendered to the Illinois State Historical Society and to the cause of history generally by Logan Hay, many years a member of this board and a member of the Society until his death on June 2, 1942.

Mr. Townley then spoke in appreciation of Mr. Hauberg's services as President of the Society during the difficult year 1941-1942. All present seconded his remarks.

The meeting then adjourned.

THE ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS, 1942-1943

Jewell F. Stevens,
President

Wayne C. Townley,
Sr. Vice President

Richard L. Beyer,
Vice President

Dwight F. Clark,
Vice President

Ernest E. East,
Vice President

Theodore C. Pease,
Vice President

George W. Smith,
Vice President

Paul M. Angle,
Secretary-Treasurer

DIRECTORS

O. F. Ander,
Rock Island

Richard L. Beyer,
Carbondale

Dwight F. Clark,
Evanston

Irving Dilliard,
Collinsville

George C. Dixon,
Dixon

Ernest E. East,
Peoria

John H. Hauberg,
Rock Island

Frank J. Heinl,
Jacksonville

James A. James,
Evanston

Theodore C. Pease,
Urbana

James G. Randall,
Urbana

Hermon Dunlap Smith,
Lake Forest

Jewell F. Stevens,
Chicago

Clint Clay Tilton,
Danville

Wayne C. Townley, *Bloomington*

LIBRARY

INDEX

Abolition
and colleges 30
and Democrats 37, 40
and Lincoln 4, 12-14
See also Antislavery views *and* slavery
Adams, ——— 82
Ainsworth, ——— 77
Alexander I, Tsar..... 73
Allen, Edward R.....48n.
Allen, George T.....34n.
Allen, T. G.....64n.
American Party .....41, 49n.
Ander, O. F.....98, 105
Anderson, Samuel .....44n.
Angle, Paul M.
report by 95-100
mentioned 96, 97, 103, 105
Anti-Nebraska Democrats (Ill.)
Bloomington convention (1856) .39-48
campaign of 1856..... 49
campaign of 1858.....59-60
campaign of 1860.....61, 64-71
and Douglas 51
editorial convention 38-39, 40
fusion with Whigs.....36ff, 50
and Missouri Compromise..... 33
oppose slavery 37
organized 32
at Republican national convention (1860) 67-69
in Republican Party..... .....33, 45, 50, 51, 56, 57, 59-71
and Republican platform..... 39
at Republican state convention (1858) 56-57
at Republican state convention (1860) 63-64
in senatorial election (1855)....34-35
support Bissell 41-42
support Judd 61-62
support Trumbull 33-35
mentioned 47, 52
See also Democrats (Ill).
Antislavery views
in colleges 23, 30
of Douglas.....35, 45, 51, 53
of Lincoln 66
See also Abolition
Army of Northern Virginia..... 16
Arnold, Isaac N.
in Congress 71
joins Republican Party..... .....44n., 56n., 57, 60, 63, 64
Augusta, Ill. 81

Baker, Henry S.....34n., 44, 45
Baker, Jehu 57
Bancroft, George 74
Baptists 20
Bateman, Newton D.....19, 27
Bates, Edward.....3, 65, 66, 68
Bear Creek 73
Beecher, Edward.....22, 23, 30
Beyer, Richard L.....98, 103, 105
Bibliographical Society of America.100
Bissell, William H.
biographical sketch 41
candidate for governor..40, 41-42, 45
governor 49, 62
"Black Republicans" 3, 4
See also Republican Party
Blaine, James G..... 69
Blair, Francis Preston, Jr..... .....14, 55, 59, 68, 70
Bloomington, Ill.
anti-Nebraska convention at....39-47
Blue Book of Illinois..... 99
Border States.....5, 8, 15
Boutwell, George 68
Brattleborough, Vt. 88
Breckinridge, John Cabell.....5, 71
Bremer, Frederika 82
Brinkerhoff, Jacob 68
Brooks, Preston 48
Bross, William.....48, 49, 66, 70
Brown, ——— 88, 89
Brown, George T.
anti-Nebraska Democrat 33, 36n., 42-43, 44, 45
Republican 48n., 56n., 57, 59, 60
Brown, John 3, 4
Browning, Orville Hickman..... .....15, 46n., 68, 69
Bryant, John H.....44n., 45n., 63
Buchanan, James
president 7, 13
vote for .....50n.
mentioned 49, 56, 61

Calhoun, John C.....17, 36n.
Cameron, Simon.....3, 65, 69
Camp Creek 73
Camp Lincoln 99
Canton, Ill. 21
Carlyle, Thomas 74
Carpenter, F. A.....63n.
Cartter, David K..... 70
Chase, Philander 21, 27
Chase, Salmon P.
  governor, Ohio.....36n., 37-38
  mentioned 3, 59, 65, 66n., 70
Chesnut, Mary Boykin..... 9
Chicago, Ill.
  Republican center 61-62
  Republican convention in.....3, 67-69
  mentioned 55, 63, 96, 101
Civil War
  beginning of 8
  effect on South..... 1
  Lincoln's responsibility 13-16
Clark, Dwight F.....
  .....101, 102, 103, 104, 105
Clark, John .....45n.
Clay, Clement 9
Clay, Henry.....11, 61, 81
Coeducation 25
Colleges (Ill.)
  athletics 29
  buildings 24
  commencements 30
  curriculums 22-23
  daily routine 29-30
  discipline 27
  expenses, students' 26-27
  finances 22
  founding 19-21
  histories 30-31
  libraries 28-29
  literary societies 28
  living conditions 25-26
  manual labor 26
  preparatory departments 25
  professions of graduates..... 25
  slavery issue 30
  students, sources of.....24-25
  See also names of specific colleges
Commerce, Ill. 76
Confederate Army 15
Confederate States 8
  See also Southerners
Congregational Church.....20, 22, 24
Congress
  and slavery in territories.....
  .....32, 47, 52, 58
  mentioned 6, 34, 54, 60
Constitutional Union Party..... 5
Cook, Burton C.
  anti-Nebraska Democrat.....
  .....34n., 43, 44n.
  Republican .....46, 57, 62, 64n.
Cook County, Ill.....44, 71n., 96
Cooper, J. P.....61n.
Cooper Institute 67
Coulson, Dr. 80
Cramer, C. H..... 99
Craven, Avery
  article by 1-18
Crittenden Compromise 14
Crooked Creek 73, 74
Cunningham, S. W.....44n.
Curtis, James M.....56-57n.

Davis, David 68, 69
Davis, Jefferson 5n., 9
Davis, O. L.....52, 64n., 67
Decatur, Ill.
  editorial convention at...38-39, 40, 47
  Republican state convention at.... 63
Declaration of Independence..... 18
Delahay, Mark W.....56n.
Democrats (Ill.)
  Administration (Buchanan).....
  .....49, 56, 61
  Anti-Douglas 49
  in campaign of 1860.....69-71
  and Douglas 51-56
  insurgency of 32ff
  and Kan.-Neb. Act..... 37
  and Lincoln 5, 11
  mentioned 4, 41, 64, 66, 81
  See also Anti-Nebraska Democrats (Ill.)
Denmark, Iowa 79, 83, 86, 88
Des Plaines, Ill.....101
Des Plaines Historical Society.....103
DeWitt County, Ill.....71n.
Diggins, Wesley .....46n.
Diller, Isaac 101
Dilliard, Irving 105
District of Columbia..... 38
Dixon, George C.....105
Doolittle, J. R..... 70
Douglas, Stephen A.
  debates with Lincoln.3n., 48n., 58, 59
  and Democratic state convention (1858) 55-56
  and Dred Scott decision....52, 58, 59
  and Kan.-Neb. Bill.....32, 48
  and Lecompton Constitution.....
  .....50-51, 53, 54, 57
  opinion of Lincoln..... 13
  party opposition to..12, 35-36, 43, 51
  and popular sovereignty.....
  .....35, 48, 52, 58, 59

and Republican Party.....50-56, 61
senator 34
senatorial campaign 50-60
and slavery 48, 51, 58
tomb 101
vote for (1860)..... 71
mentioned 14, 42, 45, 66
Dred Scott decision.....52, 57, 58, 59
Dubois, Jesse K.....45n., 60
Dunlap, Mathias L.....34n.

East, Ernest E.....103, 105
Editorial convention (Decatur, 1856) 38-39, 40, 47
Education (Ill.)
See Colleges (Ill.)
Edwards County, Ill..... 49
Ellis, John Millot..... 20
Emancipation Proclamation 10
Evans, John 39n., 44, 68
Evanston Historical Society.....100

Farnsworth, John F.....44, 47n., 49
Ferry, Elisha P.....44n., 46n.
Fillmore, Millard .....49, 62n.
Fitzhugh, George 17
Flint, Margaret 99
Fore, ——— 86
Fort Sumter 8, 13, 14, 15
Foss, Robert H.....34n.
Foster, Dr. 77
Foster, George F.....34n.
Fox, G. V..... 15
Free Soilers
anti-Nebraska views 33, 46
in Republican Party.....50, 61, 67
mentioned 35
Freeport, Ill. 48n., 58
Frémont, John Charles.....49, 50
Fugitive Slave Act.....38, 70
Fuller, Allen C.....64n.
Fulsome, E. 77

Gale, George Washington..... 20
Galena, Ill. 95
Gallatin County, Ill..... 42
Garrison, William Lloyd..... 1
Germans
fusion party seeks.....40-41, 47
oppose Know Nothings.....65, 68
in Republican Party..... 60
mentioned 39, 42, 49
Gillespie, Joseph 42, 52
Gilman, Caroline 74
Glover, James O.....44n.
Graduate Library Institute (Univ. of Chicago) 100
"Graham system" 79
Greeley, Horace 4, 54, 55
Green, D. K.....44n., 56, 57, 64n.
Greene, Theodore P..... 91
Greene, Mrs. Theodore P..... 91
Grimm, Francis .....48n.
Grimshaw, Jackson 52
Grundy County, Ill.....71n.

Hale, John P..... 70
Hamilton, Mo. 90
Hamlin, Hannibal 69
Hancock County, Ill..... 73
Hancock Prairie 73-74, 75
Hanna, B. J. F.....43, 44n., 45n.
Harding, Abner C.....46n.
Harper's Ferry, W. Va..... 4
Harrison, William Henry..... 32
Haskell, George 22
Hatch, Ozias M.....45n.
Hauberg, John H.....
.....101, 102, 103, 104, 105
Hay, D. G.....62n.
Hay, Logan 104
Hay, Mrs. Logan.....104
Hayward, Oscar C.....102
Hecker, Frederick.....46n., 49, 60, 70
Heinl, Frank J.....102, 103, 104, 105
Henry County, Ill.....71n.
Herndon, William H..... 23
Hildner, Ernest G.
article by 19-31
Hill, Benjamin H..... 2
History, teaching of.....96-99
Hoard, Samuel .....44n.
Hoffman, Francis A.....
.....41, 45, 46n., 64, 70
Homestead Bill 32
House of Representatives (U. S.)..
.....47, 55
Hunter, Robert M. T..... 15
Hussey, Obed 15

Illinois
colleges
See Colleges (Ill.)
Democrats
See Anti-Nebraska Democrats (Ill.) *and* Democrats (Ill.)
economic conditions, pioneer.....
.....76-77, 78, 82, 87
history teaching in.....96-99
living conditions, pioneer....75, 88-90
Republican Party
See Republican Party
routes to 19
schools, public 19

U. S. senator from
See Douglas, Stephen A. *and* Trumbull, Lyman
Whigs
See Whigs (Ill.)
Illinois College
abolitionism at 23, 30
curriculum 23
daily routine 29-30
expenses, student 26, 28
faculty salaries 23
financial aid sought.... 22
founded 20, 24
heresy trials 24
library 28
professions of graduates.... 25
mentioned 101
Illinois Masonic College.... 21
Illinois River 19
Illinois State Historical Library....101
Illinois State Historical Society
activities 95-100
annual meeting....95, 101-102
directors 103-105
financial report 103
Galena tour 95
Journal 96, 99, 100
membership 95-96
officers 103, 104, 105
Papers in Ill. History....99, 101
policy committee 96-98
Secretary's report....95-100
Illinois State Register....100
Indiana 64, 66, 68
Ingersoll, Robert G.... 99
Internal improvements..32, 48, 49, 57n.
Iowa Territory 73, 77
Iroquois County, Ill....71n.

Jackson, Andrew 32
Jacksonville, Ill. 101, 103
Jaffrey, N. Hamp....76, 90, 91
James, James A..101, 102, 103, 104, 105
Johnson, Marmaduke 15
Jonas, Abraham 42
Jones, T. W....44n.
Jonesboro, Ill. 20
Jonesboro College 21
Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society 96, 99, 100
Jubilee College 21, 27
Judd, Norman B.
anti-Nebraska Democrat ....
....34n., 43, 44, 45, 46n., 61
biographical sketch 61-62
in campaign of 1856.... 49
in campaign of 1860....69-70
and Douglas 53, 55
gubernatorial aspirations ..61, 62, 63
Republican national committeeman 61, 69
at Republican national convention (1856) ....48n.
at Republican national convention (1860) 64n., 67, 69
Republican state committee chairman 56, 57, 59, 61, 69
state senator 34n., 61
supports Lincoln 62, 66, 68
and Wentworth 62, 63
mentioned 51, 52, 60, 65

Kansas-Nebraska Bill....32, 37, 41, 48
Kansas Territory
admission as state....47, 51n.
slavery issue in....
....14, 32, 47, 48, 52, 53, 61n.
mentioned 35, 43
Kitchell, Edward 44n., 49
Kitchell, Wickliffe ....44n., 46n.
Know Nothings
antiforeign views 32
Germans oppose 39, 40, 65, 68
and Missouri Compromise 33
mentioned 37, 41, 42, 47, 49
Knox, James....41, 43, 44n.
Knox College
abolitionism in 30
buildings 24
expenses, student 26, 27
founding 20, 24
heresy trials 24
professions of graduates.... 25
mentioned 89, 91
Knox County, Ill....100
Koerner, Gustave
anti-Nebraska Democrat....
....36n., 41, 45
in campaign of 1856.... 49
in campaign of 1858...51n., 52, 59, 60
in campaign of 1860.... 70
governor, proposed nominee.... 42
lieutenant-governor ....39n.
at Republican national convention (1856) ....48n.
at Republican national convention (1860)....64n., 65, 67-68
at Republican state convention (1858) 56, 57
at Republican state convention (1860) 63
and Seward 65
Kreismann, Hermann ....
....44, 48n., 63, 66, 70

Labor 17
La Harpe, Ill.
founding 73, 81
land prices at..... 82
population 73
mentioned .....
....74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 87, 89, 90, 91
Land, public .....11, 57n.
Lansing, Cornelius 63
La Salle County, Ill.....71n.
Lawrence, Charles B..... 63
Lawrence, Kan. 48
Lebanon, Ill.....19, 20, 30
Lebanon Seminary 19
Lecompton Constitution...50, 53, 54, 57
Lee, Robert E.....1, 16
Lee County, Ill.....71n.
Letters from Palmyra..... 74
Letters from Rome..... 74
Lexington (steamboat) 83
Liberty Party .....64n.
Lincoln, Abraham
on abolition 12-13
and Bissell 42
at Bloomington convention..... 43
characterized 8-10, 18
Cooper Institute speech..... 67
death 9
debates with Douglas.....48n., 58, 59
Democrats support 71
election 5-7
emancipation 10, 16
foreign vote 68
Fort Sumter 8, 13-15
"House Divided" speech.....57, 66
and Know Nothings.....39n.
"lost speech" 46
party leader 3-4
politician 11, 13, 16
president-elect 71
presidential candidate.....3, 65-70
senatorial candidate.....
.....34, 48n., 51-60, 62
on slavery 12-14
Southern attitudes toward
See Southerners
speeches 7-8
symbol 2, 5
mentioned 51, 89, 97, 98
Linegar, D. T.....63n.
Loco Focos 69
Logan, Stephen T..... 43
Lovejoy, Elijah P..... 30
Lovejoy, Owen.....37, 39n., 46n.
Lynch, William O.....50n.

McClurken, Thomas .....46n.
McCormick, Cyrus Hall..... 15
McDonough College 21
McKendree College 19-20, 23, 30
McLean, John 65
MacMurray College 101
Macomb, Ill. 21
Madison County, Ill.....43, 44, 49, 71n.
"Maine Law" movement..... 32
Marion County, Ill..... 44
Martineau, Harriet 74, 75
Masonic Lodge 21
Matheny, Willard R.....98, 102
Matteson, Joel A..... 34
Medill, Joseph 70
Methodists 19-20
Michie, James .....44n., 45n.
Michigan 19
Middle States 11, 15
Mill, P. H..... 17
Miller, James .....45n.
Milton, George Fort..... 14
Minnesota 19, 91
Mississippi .....5n., 6n.
Mississippi River
route to Illinois..... 19
travel on 77-79, 85-86
mentioned 73, 75, 83, 87
Mississippi Valley Historical Association 100
Missouri Compromise ...32, 33, 37, 59
Montebello, Ill. 76
Moore, T. C.....43, 64n.
Morgan County Historical Society.
.....100, 101
Mormons 76, 79, 80, 81, 87
Musham, H. A..... 99

Nativism 39, 68
Naturalization laws.....39, 40
Nauvoo, Ill. 76, 79, 81, 82
Nebraska Territory 32, 47
Negroes
Fitzhugh on 17
Lincoln on 3n., 16, 18
Southerners on 4
mentioned 10
See also Slavery
New England
family from, in Ill.....72-92
See Smith, Elizabeth Stearns *and* Smith, William
New Hampshire .....
....72, 73, 76, 77, 80, 81, 89, 90, 91
New Jersey 69
New Orleans, La.....73, 76, 79
Niles, Nathaniel.....43, 44n., 45
North Carolina..... 16
Northwest 11, 12, 48
Norton, Jesse O..... 41

Ogden, William B.....39n., 46n.
Ohio 37, 59, 65, 70
Ohio River
route to Ill..... 19
travel on.....75, 83, 84-85
mentioned 11, 78
Ohio Valley 11
Olney, John.....61, 64n.
Oregon 11
Orme, W. W.....46n.

Pacific Ocean 12
Pacific railroad .....49, 57n.
Paley, William 23
Palmer, John M.
at anti-Nebraska convention.....
.....44n., 45, 46
in campaign of 1858....54, 59, 60, 62
in campaign of 1860..... 70
congressional nomination refused by 47
and Douglas 36n., 52-53
in Ill. Senate.....34n.
at Republican national convention (1856) .....48n.
at Republican national convention (1860) 64n., 68, 69
at Republican state convention (1858) 56
at Republican state convention (1860) 63
Panic of 1837..... 22
Panic of 1857..... 57
Papers in Illinois History.....99, 101
Parks, Gavion D. A.....
.....34n., 39n., 44n., 45n.
Parks, Samuel C.....46n.
Pease, Theodore C.....103, 105
Peck, Ebenezer.....41, 44n., 54, 63, 66
Peck, John Mason..... 22
Pennsylvania 64, 66, 69
Peoria, Ill 21
Peoria County, Ill..... 43
Peoria Star 99
Peterborough, N. H...72, 74, 76, 81, 90
Philadelphia, Pa. 47
Phillips, David L.
anti-Nebraska Democrat.....
.....39n., 44n., 45n., 46
Republican .....56n., 57, 64n.
Pierce, Franklin.....32, 48, 50n., 71
Plato, William B.....44, 63, 64n.
Poetry of Traveling in the United States 74
Popular sovereignty .....
.....35, 48, 52, 53, 58, 59
Powell, William H..... 45
Powers, William B.....44n.

Prairies 75
Presbyterian Church 20, 21, 22, 24
Prohibition 32
Prothrow, William .....44n.

Quick, Thomas .....49n., 57n.
Quincy and Adams County, Historical Society of.....100

Ramsdell, Charles W..... 14
Ramsey, Silas 42
Randall, James G.....102, 105
Ray, Charles H.
anti-Nebraska Democrat .....
.....38, 39n., 40, 44n., 46n.
in campaign of 1858.....55, 59, 60
in Ill. Senate..... 33
and Know Nothings.....40-41, 47
supports Lincoln 34n., 54, 66, 70
mentioned 42, 45, 63
Republican Party
birth 12, 33
and Bloomington convention.....40-47
in campaign of 1856.....49-50
in campaign of 1858.....58-60
in campaign of 1860.....61-62, 64-71
Democrats in.....
.....33, 45, 50, 51, 56, 57, 59-71
and Douglas 50-56, 61
Free Soilers in.....50, 61, 67
Lincoln candidate of.....
.....3, 48n., 51-60, 62, 65-71
platform (1856) 39
on slavery.....12, 14, 52, 58, 60, 61
Southern attitudes toward.....4, 10
state convention (1858).....56-57
state convention (1860)..... 63
and Trumbull 35, 38
Whigs in.....12, 33, 50, 51, 56-57, 60, 61, 64, 65, 68, 71
mentioned 89
See also "Black Republicans"
Reynolds, ——— 77, 82, 87
Reynolds, Caroline Smith.79, 80, 86, 87
See also Smith, Caroline
Richardson, William A.....49n.
Richter, Victor W.....103
Ritchie, Thomas 15
River travel 78-79, 83-87
Rivers and harbors..... 48
Rives, George W.....57n.
Robertson, Ben 1
Rock Island, Ill.....21, 95
Rock Spring, Ill..... 20
Ruffin, Edmund 17
Rutherford, Friend S.....
.....44, 46n., 56n., 60, 64n.
Rutherford, Mildred Lewis..... 9

St. Clair County, Ill.....49, 50n., 71n.
St. Louis, Mo.....78, 82, 85, 86, 88
Sangamon County, Ill..... 43
Schneider, George
anti-Nebraska Democrat.....38, 44n.
in campaign of 1856..... 49
in campaign of 1858..... 60
influence on Republicans..... 39
at Republican national convention (1856) .....48n., 64n.
mentioned 63
Schools (Ill.)
public 19
See also Colleges (Ill.)
Schurz, Carl 35, 68
Schuyler Presbytery 21
Scripps, John L.....43, 44n., 66, 70
Seattle, Wash. 91
Secession
Lincoln on 7, 13, 14, 16
South Carolina ordinance...13, 15-16
Virginia and 15-16
Selby, Paul .....39n., 42n.
Seminaries, female 21
Senate
See United States: Senate
Seward, William H.
presidential nominee, proposed.....3, 65, 66, 69
mentioned 1, 55
Sharp, Thomas C.....47n.
Sheahan, James W..... 51
Sherman, Francis C..... 44
Shields, James A..... 34
Shurtleff College 20, 22, 26, 30
Skinner, Mark 44
Slave trade 57
Slavery
colleges, issue in..... 30
Decatur convention on..... 38
Democrats on 36, 37, 70
Douglas on 51, 58, 59-60
Lincoln on.....3n., 6, 8, 12-14, 66-67
Republicans on.....52, 53, 57, 60, 61
Southerners on.....1, 13-14, 16-17
in territories 14, 32, 47, 48, 52, 53, 57, 58-59
Trumbull on 35, 38
in Virginia 15
Wentworth on 70
See also Abolition *and* Negroes
Sloo, James C.....42, 64n.
Smith, Albert.....87, 90, 91
Smith, Caroline.....76, 77
See also Reynolds, Caroline Smith
Smith, Elizabeth.....87, 89, 90, 91
Smith, Elizabeth Stearns
children.....77, 80, 83, 87, 92
See also individual names
death 91
frontier living conditions....75, 88-90
household furnishings...74-75, 88, 90
journeys to Ill.....74-75, 83-87
in New England.....80-83
mentioned 76, 78, 79, 92
See also Stearns, Elizabeth
Smith, George W.....103, 105
Smith, Harry 77
Smith, Hermon Dunlap.....102, 105
Smith, Hyrum 81
Smith, John 72
Smith, John, Jr.....76, 77
Smith, Jonathan 80, 83
Smith, Jonathan II.....87, 90, 91
Smith, Joseph 81
Smith, Mary 91
Smith, Susan Stearns..73, 77, 79, 88, 89
Smith, William
business interests.....74, 76-77, 78, 81-82, 87, 88, 90
death 90
flatboat trip.....77-79
marriage 73
politics 89, 90
settles in Ill.....73, 75
mentioned...72, 79, 80, 83, 85, 86, 92
Smith, William, Jr. ("Willie")
birth 77
education 88, 89
illness 83, 85, 86
mentioned 84, 91
Smith, William A..... 17
Society for the Promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West..... 22
Solomon, P. B.....44n.
South Carolina.....13, 15
South Dakota..... 91
Southerners
attitudes toward Lincoln
and abolition.....12-13
character 8-9
death 9
election 5-7
emancipation proclamation..... 10
Fort Sumter.....8, 13-15
nomination 3
party leader.....3-4
politician 11, 13, 16
reverence for.....1, 10
and slavery.....12-14
speeches 7-8
symbol 2, 5
"unreconstructed" views.....9-10

Squatter sovereignty
See Popular sovereignty
Stadtman, C. C.....96, 97
Stagecoach travel..... 84
Stark, J.....64n.
Steamboats
See River travel
Stearns, Chloe..... 72
Stearns, Elizabeth.....72-73
See also Smith, Elizabeth Stearns
Stearns, Fidelia..... 83
Stearns, John.....72, 77(?)
Stearns, Josiah..... 88
Stephenson County, Ill.....100
Stevens, Jewell F.....
.....98, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105
Stoler, Mildred C.
article by.....32-71
Story of Illinois, The (booklet).... 99
Sturtevant, Julian M..... 23
Sumner, Charles..... 48
Supreme Court (U. S.)..48, 57, 58, 59

Tacoma, Wash..... 91
Tariffs 11
Taylor, Zachary..... 32
Tennessee 16
Territories
slavery issue in.....
.....14, 32, 47, 48, 52, 53, 57, 58-59
Thomas, John.....47n.
Thomas, William..... 52
Tilden, Samuel J..... 14
Tilton, Clint Clay.....105
Tocqueville, Alexis Charles Henri Maurice Clérel de..... 18
Topeka Constitution..... 47
Townley, Wayne C.....
.....101, 102, 103, 104, 105
Travel, western.....75, 78-79, 83-87
Trible, John.....44, 46, 52
Trumbull, George..... 52
Trumbull, Lyman
anti-Nebraska Democrat.....
.....35-36, 37, 43
in campaign of 1856..... 49
in campaign of 1858.....59-60
in campaign of 1860..... 70
characterized 35
and Douglas.....35-36, 48, 53, 58
supports Lincoln.....54, 66, 70
U.S. Senator..33-36, 54, 61, 62, 64, 71
views on slavery.....35, 38
mentioned.....39n., 40, 41, 42, 55, 65
Turner, Thomas J.
anti-Nebraska Democrat..... 33
joins Republican Party.....34n., 45
at Republican state convention (1858) 56-57
at Republican state convention (1860) 63
Turney, L. J. S..... 43
Tyler, Alice Felt
article by.....72-92
Tyler, John..... 91
Tyler, Lyon G..... 10

Unitarian Church.....76, 80
United States
House of Representatives.....47, 55
Senate
and Douglas.....51-59
and Lincoln..3n., 34, 48n., 51-59, 62
Sumner-Brooks episode..... 48
and Trumbull.....
.....33-36, 54, 61, 62, 64, 71
Supreme Court.....48, 57, 58, 59
United States Revenue (ship)..... 84
Upper Alton, Ill.....20, 30

Van Buren, Martin.....39n.
Vincenz, ——— 47
Virginia 15, 16

Wabash County, Ill..... 49
Wade, Benjamin Franklin..... 3
Walbrecht, George.....46n., 47
Washburne, Elihu B.....58n.
Washington, George.....3, 10
Weber, George R.....43, 61
Webster, Daniel.....81, 90
Weed, Thurlow..... 55
Weldon, Lawrence.....64n.
Wentworth, John
anti-Nebraska Democrat..44n., 45, 46
candidate for Chicago mayor..... 63
and Judd.....62, 63
and Lincoln..... 70
mentioned 36n., 43
Wenzell, Francis.....44n.
Western Chroniclers.....100
Wheat 11, 15
Whigs (Ill.)
in campaign of 1858..... 60
in campaign of 1860.....62, 65
and Douglas 51
and editorial convention.....38-39, 40
fusion with anti-Nebraska Democrats 36ff, 50
and Republican convention (1856) 40, 45, 46, 47
and Republican convention (1860) 68-69
in Republican Party....12, 33, 50, 51, 56-57, 60, 61, 64, 65, 68, 71, 89

in senatorial election (1854)..... 34
support Bissell.....42, 49
support Trumbull 36, 54
mentioned....11, 32, 38, 47, 52, 66, 81
Whitely, Simeon .....38n.
Whitman, J..... 74
Whitney, Henry C.....62n.
Wiley, Benjamin T.....46n.
William and Mary College..... 10
Williams, Lucy C.....103
Wisconsin 19
Wise, Henry Alexander..... 15
Worth, Jonathan 8

Yale University 20
Yates, Richard.....43, 56n.

Zion, Ill. 76

KING'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY